







~~H Ref~~

<36623489180010

S

<36623489180010

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

PRESENT STATE

OF THE

CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE

PROTESTANTS AND PAPISTS

OF

Great Britain and Ireland

AND THE

How far the same is consistent with the

Principles of Liberty

AND

The Relevance of Two Discourses

Delivered at

Clergy of the Archdiocese of Cleveland, in

the Years 1767 and 1768.

By FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, M.A.

Archdeacon of Cleveland.

L O N D O N,

Printed by A. MILLAR, and T. CADELL, in

THE Strand, NEAR ST. MARTIN'S CHURCH.

✓ 252

Hist. anal. 132.

CONSIDERATIONS
ON THE
PRESENT STATE
OF THE
CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN THE
PROTESTANTS and PAPISTS
OF
GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND;
Particularly on the Question

R How far the latter are entitled to a TOLERATION
upon PROTESTANT PRINCIPLES.

BEING
The SUBSTANCE of TWO DISCOURSES
Delivered to the
Clergy of the Archdeaconry of CLEVELAND, in
the Years 1765 and 1766.

By FRANCIS BLACKBURNE, M.A.
Archdeacon of CLEVELAND.

L O N D O N,
Printed for A. MILLAR; and T. CADELL, in
The Strand. MDCCLXVIII.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
MÜNCHEN

But that being otherwise determined, it was
sending any part of these papers to the press.
I should hardly have thought of
as much as at first. In the summer of
1706, I should hardly have thought of
sending any part of these papers to the press.
But that being otherwise determined, it was

L O N D O N

Printed for A. Millar; and T. Cadell, in
the Strand, near St. Dunstons Church.

TO THE
Reverend and much respected
THE
CLERGY of the ARCHDEACONRY
OF
CLEVELAND.

HAD not the publication of the latter
of these Discourses been desired by
such of you, my REVEREND BRETHREN,
as met me at THIRSKE in the Summer of
1766, I should hardly have thought of
sending any part of these papers to the press.
But that being otherwise determined, it was

next to be considered, that the second Discourse, being only the sequel to one delivered the year before, could not well appear without that introduction, which was the more necessary, as it contained some authorities to which the latter Discourse referred, and on which several particulars in it had some dependence.

The obliging manner in which the publication of that little piece was proposed, left me no room to decline it; and, as both Discourses were drawn up without any view to their being made public, the revisal of both became necessary, which immediately suggested the propriety of a more convenient arrangement of their contents, and of throwing them into one continued Discourse; without any other alterations, however, than such as a more methodical disposition of the several parts, and the correction of the inaccuracies in the written copies, made indispensable.

DEDICATION.

v

As this was doing, many things occurred, very proper, as appeared to me, to illustrate as well as to confirm some particulars, which, in so short discourses, would not admit of circumstantial details; more especially such as related to the objections on the one hand, and the pleas, on the other, of certain late writers in favour of Popery, whose misrepresentations of matters of fact, and sophisms in reasoning, seemed to require a more particular refutation, than, as far as I could learn, they had then met with.

These additional matters are put into the form of notes, and may serve, I would humbly hope, to point out some circumstances in the present state of Popery among us that may deserve the particular notice of us who are more immediately concerned to warn our respective congregations against these delusive corrupters of Christianity, and may not be unworthy of the regard of every dutiful

dutiful and affectionate subject of our most gracious Sovereign upon the throne.

The book of which an account is given, in the first number of the *Appendix*, was put into my hands by one to whom it was privately conveyed, with what intent, I need not say; and it may be presumed, that the view there given of that book, may be of use to convince those who are but moderately versed in other particulars of our controversy with the Papists, that a religion which requires the support of such mean and pitiful forgeries, and enjoins such shameful acts of idolatry, can recommend itself to none but those who are either grossly ignorant of the contents of the Christian Scriptures, or hold them in the utmost contempt.

The reasons for exhibiting the other pieces in the *Appendix* are explained, either by references in the *Considerations* and *Notes*, or by the remarks subjoined to them.

I most

DEDICATION. vii

I most willingly take this opportunity to express the grateful sense I have of the candid reception I have always met with since my first appearance among you, and of the ready assistance you have afforded me on various occasions, in the discharge of my office; and am,

Reverend and much esteemed Brethren,

your obliged and affectionate Brother,

and humble Servant,

FR. BLACKBURNE.

CONSI-

CONSIDERATIONS ON

The Present State of the Controversy, &c.

THE frequent remonstrances, which have appeared in public, from time to time, in different parts of the kingdom, concerning the too successful attempts of the priests and other emissaries of the church of *Rome*, to pervert his Majesty's Protestant subjects to that communion, gave me occasion, the last year, to recommend a particular inquiry into the state of Popery within this Archdeaconry; the returns to which, by the care and attention of the reverend the clergy, were sufficiently exact and particular to shew, that such remonstrances have not been wholly groundless, and at the same time to afford occasion for some very striking and obvious remarks upon particular cases, not indeed peculiar to the places from whence they are reported in those returns, but, as we learn from other authentic accounts, common to many others in like circumstances, all over the nation.

On this consideration, it may not be unseasonable to bestow a few serious reflexions on the present state of Popery in these kingdoms, tending to shew,
A from

from some remarkable incidents, that the late alarms concerning the progress and increase of this dangerous superstition have not been so chimerical as some, seemingly cool and candid, but certainly injudicious, and perhaps designing, lookers-on, would have us believe^a; and that this is no time to suspend our vigilance and activity in counter-working the means made use of for its propagation.

Our misfortune, for some time past, seems to have been, that while we thought ourselves and our people sufficiently secure from the open attempts of Popish emissaries, by the legal provisions that are made against them, our attention has been unhappily diverted by that circumstance, from their more secret and insidious practices upon particular persons who have fallen in their way. Some of us perhaps may have expected, that they would have been restrained in these attempts, by a principle of gratitude for the lenity of our civil government in conniving at their enjoyment of their own worship, while their priests should content themselves with ministering to such only as have been born of Popish parents, and educated in that communion.

But they who have entertained these expectations could not, I believe, readily find an instance

^a Of this kind were some letters, which appeared some time ago in the *St. James's Chronicle*, signed *Sacerdos Rusticus*, and other essays of the same tendency, in that and other News-papers.

in all *Europe*, where Popery has been satisfied with a bare connivance, on *any* consideration. Her claims and pretensions rise too high to be controuled by a principle of gratitude. A church which arrogates to herself *all power in heaven and earth*, on the one hand, and whose very existence, on the other, depends upon the pompous and conspicuous exhibition of a paganish ceremonial, will never patiently submit to be confined to a corner ; or acquiesce in any terms where her peculiar merit, *VISIBILITY*, is excluded from the advantages of parade and ostentation ^a.

If indeed scripture, reason, and common sense were to have their full influence upon the hearts and understandings of all those who profess the Protestant religion, the claims and pretensions of Popery would be easily seen thro', and universally despised. But while such numbers of our common people are so imperfectly instructed in the principles of their religion (as we have reason to fear they are) that it may be questioned whe-

^a The splendid and even superb decorations of popish chapels, particularly in some of our cities and great towns, are instances of this to the purpose, where even the rod of civil correction hanging over their heads, will not prevent their triumphing in this way over the plain simplicity in places of public worship, prescribed by the principles of the Protestant Reformation. In some cities, it is said, the popish chapel is shewn to strangers, as one of the curiosities of the place. And I have heard of *one* where the door of the chapel is reported to stand open in the day-time to the street, from whence there is a prospect to the altar, *etc.*

ther many of them can give any better account of them, than that they derived them from their parents, where is the wonder that such uninformed minds should be greatly overmatched by the subtlety and indefatigable perseverance of the bigoted agents of a church which sets herself up for the mother and mistress of Christendom?

The current opinion of those who look no farther into religious matters than mere outward appearances, hath generally been, that the truth and excellency of religion is most likely to be found with those who are most zealous in promoting their own particular sort of it. Few of these will consider, that there may be high degrees of zeal where there is not a grain of knowledge; and fewer still will be disposed to undertake an accurate and laborious inquiry into the real truth and importance of doctrines which are asserted with the utmost confidence on one hand, while they are but feebly and faintly opposed on the other.

Insinuations have been thrown out of late, as if this had been too much the case between the protestant and popish clergy in this country. It has been mentioned in some late publications, that for some years past, little attention has been paid by the clergy of the establishment to that branch of controversy, which our predecessors of the last century managed against the Papists with so much assiduity, with so much honour to themselves,

selves, and advantage to the cause they espoused ^b.

To this it hath been answered, that “this service to the protestant cause, having been so well performed, and being to be found in books which are easily procured, it is sufficient to refer our people to the labours of these excellent writers of the last generation, whenever they are practised upon by the adversary; and that, having the scriptures in their hands, and being not only allowed, but exhorted to read them, they may safely be trusted to their own sense and judgment in applying them to the support of their principles, against all seducers whatsoever.”

But I am afraid, when the circumstances of our common people abovementioned are duly considered, together with the various occasions they may have for the assistance of their pastors in new and unforeseen cases, our referring them to their own stores and capacities, will pass for no

^b — *Élevé en ANGLETERRE, où les controverses ROMAINES sont peu à la mode, je n’y avois jamais tourné mes études.* These are the words of Mr. *De la Chapelle*, minister at the *Hague*, in the preface to his excellent letters, in answer to those of Father *Scheffmacher*, a Jesuit of *Strasburgh*, published at *Amsterdam* 1737. Perhaps it might be found upon examination, that this controversy has not been much more in fashion, for the last thirty years. What the reasons, why it has not, may have been, I pretend not to determine; but apprehend they may deserve the consideration of the public.

better than a compliment to our own indolence, a sort of civil way of getting rid of the pains and trouble of making those whose station and circumstances require it, more competent judges for themselves, than their own leisure and opportunities for examination will admit of, and who may expect this service from us, through a persuasion that our designation to the ministry requires it at our hands.

Any objection against our remissness in this particular case, will have the greater force, where there is room for it, in consideration, that of all the various sorts and sects of religion professed in the Christian world, Popery is that to which a good Christian and a good subject may be indifferent with the least safety, whether we consider its political influence upon civil society, or its pernicious effects upon the religious dispositions of every one concerned to work out his salvation upon the best and surest grounds.

We see little indeed of this malignant influence in our own country, where the protestant religion is established, and professed by public authority, and where Roman Catholics have no share either in the civil or ecclesiastical government. In these circumstances the spirit of Popery is kept down, and withdrawn from public observation, and exerts itself only in private cabals and projects to counterwork the establishment of what they call *heresy*, and to prepare their engines against
some

some favourable crisis to carry their designs into execution. In the mean while their public demeanor is fair and candid, and has all the appearances of moderation and charity, that are necessary to persuade the unthinking multitude of the injustice of those charges that have been brought against their religion, and the unreasonableness of those legal restraints which are laid upon the professors of it.

But to form a proper judgment of the spirit and influence of Popery, it will be necessary to look into the history of those countries where it is, and has been for ages past, the established religion; and here, besides the practice of the most abject superstition, and even of the grossest idolatry, we shall find, that whenever the civil powers have attempted to provide for the public welfare by measures or expedients in any degree unfavourable to the peculiar interests of the church, means have always been found to break the peace of the community, by some or other of those turbulent ecclesiastics, whom the mistaken zeal of former times hath nourished by luxurious provisions, and exclusive privileges, in a state of detachment from the body politic; a set of men, who, whatever might be the original design of their respective founders, have not, for many ages, been of any other use worth the mentioning, than that of strengthening the iron hand of

papal authority, and thereby preventing the civil magistrate, wherever he was inclined to it, from lightening the galling yoke of ecclesiastical tyranny. And where the monkish orders are so numerous, and confessors, taken out of them, have so frequently had the consciences of sovereign princes under their direction, occasions and pretences could never be wanting to controul the most salutary counsels for public welfare, if they should interfere ever so little with the claims or prerogatives of the hierarchy.

The neighbouring kingdom of *France* hath perhaps made more vigorous efforts in opposition to the encroachments of the See of *Rome*, than any popish state in *Europe*: and there are instances in the *French* histories, where these efforts have not been altogether without success. But the same histories inform us, that any advantages of this kind gained over the church, have, for the most part, been either dearly purchased, or of no long continuance ^c. And generally speaking, whatever abatements of the pa-

^c The various struggles of the French patriots to establish and support the *Pragmatic Sanction*, as set forth by Bishop *Burnet* in his *History of the rights of Princes in the disposing of Ecclesiastical Benefices and Church-lands*, chap. vii. and the event of those struggles, shew this in the strongest point of light. According to Dr. *Heylin* (no enemy, by the way, to ecclesiastical usurpations), it was made appear to *Lewis XI*, that the execution of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, was a saving to *France* of a million of crowns annually. *Hist. of the State of France*, p. 224.

pal power have been obtained in any states and kingdoms which did not absolutely cast it off, the sovereign pontiff, having the religious orders entirely under his direction, and at his devotion, hath found the means to balance, by obtaining ample concessions in other articles. And where he hath not succeeded by way of compromise, he hath seldom failed, by the means of the same trusty agents, to take severe vengeance, sooner or later, on those who stood in his way.

A few instances from the history of *France* will be sufficient to shew, that what is here advanced is not without foundation.

From the time that the Protestant religion gained any considerable footing in *France*, the zealous Catholics, as they called themselves, with the princes of the House of *Guise* at their head, left no means untried to extirpate it. But the Hugonots, gathering strength from the accession of numbers, and the high quality of those who professed themselves of the same faith, came to be in a condition to resist the efforts of the catholic faction, oftentimes with remarkable success. The consequence of which was a succession of civil wars in the very heart of the kingdom, productive of all the misery and ruin that necessarily attend events of that sort.

The greatest and wisest of the *French* patriots, even they who adhered no less to the established religion than the most violent of the persecutors
of

of the Hugonots, plainly saw that not only the peace and prosperity, but the very safety and existence of the kingdom of *France*, depended upon granting the Protestants a legal toleration for the public exercise of their religion; and to that end interposed their counsels and endeavours, as far as the complexion of the times, and the violent prejudices of their bigoted fellow-subjects would bear ^d.

This proposal, however, was too unfavourable to the interests, and too grating to the intolerant spirit, of the church of *Rome*, to be admitted by

^d Among the foremost of these was the excellent *Michael de L'Hospital*, Chancellor of *France*, who, besides defeating the projects of introducing into that kingdom first the inquisition, and afterwards the authority of the Council of *Trent*, the two favourite objects of the Cardinal of *Lorraine*, would most probably, if he could, have obtained a toleration for the protestants. [See his article in Bayle's *Dictionary*]. Such was his influence and estimation, that even this important point was lost in the parliament of *Paris*, only by three voices, and given up with great murmurings, by the minority, who maintained, upon the chancellor's principles, *qu'en matiere de telle importance, n'estoit pas la raison, qu'à l'appetit de trois voix, tout la France entraist en combustion*. *Lettres d'Esienne Pasquier*, vol. I. p. 196. ed. 1619. To detract from *L'Hospital's* merit in these salutary counsels, it is alledged, that he was a protestant in his heart, which indeed would not have been marvellous in a man of his piety and penetration. This however is a circumstance of no weight in the present case, since writers of all sorts who have mentioned him, agree, that his whole conduct shewed, that he had the real good of the king and people uniformly at heart. See *Davila*, B. ii. and Bayle *ubi supra*.

the clergy, or the great men who were partly the dupes of *their* hypocrisy, and partly induced by their own ambitious views to foment their frantic zeal among the people. And on this foundation, namely, the pretence to secure the catholic church against the attempts of the heretical Hugonots, was formed that wicked combination called *The League*, the effects of which were, besides the horrors of an intestine war, the bloody and treacherous massacre of *Paris*, and the murder of two of their sovereigns.

Whether the objection of the Leaguers against *Henry III*, namely, his favouring the Hugonots, was real or pretended (a matter which the weak and fluctuating conduct of that unhappy prince hath rendered extremely doubtful), it is certain, that circumstance was made the colour for the opposition he met with from that bigoted faction, as well as for the justification of the monk who assassinated him, both in *France* and at *Rome* ^e.

^e See the Letter of the Leaguers to Pope *Sixtus V*, May 25, 1589, about two months before the assassination, in the *Memoires de la Ligue*, Tom. III. p. 326, and their Letter to the same Pope, immediately after it, in *Bayle's Dictionary*, HENRY III. Rem. [R]. See likewise the Pope's Speech to a Congregation of Cardinals, September 11, 1589, in the IVth vol. of Lord *Somers's* Tracts, published in 1748, p. 201. In these writings, Popery speaks her native language, the language of her cordial affections and invariable principles; a language very different from what she uses when, in *Great Britain*, she wants to palliate a Powder-plot or an *Irish* massacre, or to recommend herself to the powers in being for a toleration, upon the flimsy pretence,
It

It was the inclination, as well as the interest, of HENRY IV, who succeeded him, to avoid the mistakes of his predecessor, and to make his subjects happy and prosperous upon better plans of policy, which his experience and capacity for government readily suggested to him. The first step, was to compose the religious feuds and dissensions between his popish and protestant subjects, which had been the occasion of such a series of public calamity. The *Catholics*, so called, had the legal establishment on their side, and were, out of all comparison, the majority. But the Hugonots were nevertheless a respectable body, firm and resolute in their purposes and demands, and by no means disabled from giving trouble to their oppressors and persecutors. *Henry* found it necessary, in these circumstances, to sacrifice his profession of the Protestant religion to humour the Papists, and was, in many other respects, more complaisant to the fiery zeal of his ecclesiastics, than true policy would have allowed him to be in any other situation ^f. To balance these advantages in the scale of Popery, he granted the

that her unlimited subjection to ecclesiastical injunctions implies the same *meekness* and *submission* to civil authority, even in *heretical* hands.

^f “HENRY the Fourth,” says Bishop *Burnet*, “having been
“for many years (that which they call) an *heretic*, stood not so
“firm in his contests, either with the Pope or his clergy, as
“other princes, that had been educated in a different manner,
“perhaps would have done.” *Hist. of the Rights of Princes*,
&c. p. 261.

Protestants

Protestants the edict of *Nantes*, modified in such a manner as to keep the peace between the two parties; and in the maintenance of this wise ordinance he was ever steady and determined to the last. But this being the case, all his concessions to his furious and bigotted *Catholics* went for nothing. This edict was represented by the clergy, and consequently considered by their devotees, as the leprous token of an heretical taint, which could not be discharged, but by the murderous hand of a jesuitical ruffian &.

& *Le même jour* (the day of *Ravilliac's* execution) *sur les plaintes portées à la cour, par l'Archevêque d'Aix, par le pere Coeffeteau, et par autres personnes sages, que le dit Ravilliac, interrogé par eux sur le parricide par lui commis, leur avoit repondu, conformément aux maximes de Mariana, de Becanus, et autres [Jesuits] qui ont écrit, qu'il étoit permis de tuer les Tyrans; la dite cour, &c.* Journal du Regne d'*Henry IV*, p. 212. See more proofs of *Ravilliac's* deriving his principles from the Jesuits, in *Hospinian's Hist. Jesuitica*, p. 261. The weakest, and one may justly call it the fatal, measure of *Henry's* government, was his restoration of the Jesuits, after a proscription of some years, occasioned by the atrocious attempt of *John Chastel*, one of their pupils, upon his life, in the year 1594. Whatever *Henry's* private reasons might be for this indulgence, his compliance was certainly an inexcusable error, as not only the University of *Paris*, but the Parliament would have supported him vigorously in the total exclusion of that pernicious sect. This sufficiently appears by what passed in the Parliament about eighteen months after the King's tragical death. That court entered upon a revision of the letters patent the King had granted the Jesuits, permitting them to open their colleges; and refused to verify them, but upon condition of their subscribing the following propositions. “ 1. That a Council is above the Pope.

During

During the reign of *Lewis* the Thirteenth, the administration of the *French* government was wholly in the hands of an ambitious and tyrannical churchman, the Cardinal *de Richelieu*, which is sufficient to characterise it, without descending to particulars. Under a minister of that profession, it is not to be expected the state would attempt to profit at the expence of the church ^h.

“ 2. That the Pope hath no temporal power over Kings. 3.
 “ That clergymen having heard of any attempt or conspiracy
 “ against the King or his Realm, or any matter of Treason, in
 “ confession, they are bound to reveal it. 4. That clergymen
 “ are subject to the secular prince or public magistrate.” I take these propositions, for brevity’s sake, from *Heylin’s* Survey of the State of *France*, p. 224, 225. But they may be seen more at length in *Hospinian’s* Hist. Jesuit. p. 220. where there are likewise some conditions still harder of digestion. *Heylin* says, they submitted to them, and subscribed; and it is probable enough they did, as the Parliament had peremptorily determined to prohibit their schools, if they refused. The famous *Fronto Ducæus* was their orator on this occasion, who, according to *Hospinian*, played the sophister very dextrously. The Journal of the Reign of *Henry* the Fourth gives us a curious instance of jesuitical impudence and finesse. It is in the last paragraph of the book, and is thus related. “ On *Monday* the last day
 “ of *May*, and very early in the morning, a number of Jesuits,
 “ accompanied by some of their particular confidants, set out
 “ [from *Paris*] to carry to their house of *La Flesche* the heart
 “ of the King, which had been granted to them on their repeated solicitations. But they would not have carried it off
 “ without noise and disturbance, if the affair had got wind
 “ among the people.” The reason is plain, the people were persuaded that the man who had murdered the King on the 14th of the same month, was a pupil of the Jesuits.

^h The Cardinal indeed talked high to the Pope upon some
 The

The opposition of *Lewis XIV*, to the see of *Rome*, was, on several occasions, more open and

occasions; that is to say, when his Holiness was not so ready to gratify him or his creatures in their particular demands, as he expected. *Vie de Richelieu*, vol. II. p. 386. But his inclination to maintain the church in its full power at the expence of the state, appears from his advising the King to abolish the appeals of the secular clergy from their Bishops to the courts of Parliament. *Servien*, the Advocate-general, was so sensible of the great advantage of keeping the clergy in a due dependance upon the state by the means of these appeals, that he used to say, "had he known the author of so wise and salutary a regulation, he would have erected his statue." See *Testament Politique de Cardinal Duc de Richelieu*, sect. xi. It should seem, by what Mr. *Duchat* says, in a note upon *Henry Stephens's* Apology for *Herodotus*, vol. I. p. 62. of the *Hague*-edition, 1735, that those Bishops whom he calls *Constitutionnaires* made no scruple, in order to accomplish this abolition, to attempt, by their mandates, the abolition of the prerogatives of the crown, and the liberties of the *Gallican* church. For the rest, the infamous use he made of the *Religious* of both sexes at *Loudun*, in the prosecution of *Urbain Grandier*, shews that he well knew to what services of tyranny and despotic vengeance the enthusiastic bigotry of those fraternities might be turned. This consideration, it is probable enough, made him the more desirous to have the Bulls for the confirmation of his dignity of Abbot-general of the *Cistercians* and *Premonstrants* expedited from *Rome*. It is certain nothing ever provoked his resentment against the Pope more than the delay of those Bulls. But the Pope, no doubt, knew as well as the Cardinal, the probable consequences of putting those large and opulent communities under the government of so enterprizing a genius, with the whole civil power of *France* in his hands. *Vie de Richelieu*, u. s. After perusing a variety of Memoirs of this Cardinal, wherein he is uniformly represented by all, but his fulsome panegyrists, as adapting his

avowed;

avowed; and in some of these he had the concurrence of the secular clergy, under the notion of his protecting the liberty of the *Gallican* Church, against the claims of the *Roman* Pontiff; where indeed the interest of the crown was full as much concerned as that of the churchⁱ. This,

politics solely to the preservation of his power, and the purposes of his ambition and revenge, one cannot but wonder upon what facts a late Biographer of *Henry IV* should reckon *Richelieu* among those *French* ministers who pursued the salutary and spirited plans of government delineated by that monarch. See Appendix to the *Monthly Review*, vol. XXXIV. p. 562. It is for the honour of *Salmasius*, that he refused a large pension from *Richelieu*, because the condition was that he should write the Cardinal's History in Latin. See *Guy Patin's* Letters, vol. I. Lett. ii. and the reason there given by *Salmasius* himself.

ⁱ This is to be understood of the affair of the *Regale*, which however was strenuously opposed by the Bishops of *Alet* and *Pamiers*, who betook themselves to the protection of the Pope against the pretensions of the King; and here began the differences between *Lewis XIV* and *Innocent XI*. These two Bishops were *Jansenists*, that is to say, they were of that denomination of Religionists, who had complained to the Pope of the scandal given, and the mischief occasioned, by the loose morality of the Jesuits, and had obtained a formal censure of it from the congregation *de propaganda fide*. This provocation detached the Jesuits from the Holy See of course, at least from the Pope then reigning, and engaged them to the court of *France*, and the Bishops who adhered to it, in opposition to the Pope; a step which naturally exposed the Jesuits to the reproach of having broken their fourth vow; *viz.* of absolute obedience to the Pope. "But," says Bishop *Burnet*, "that the zealous Catholics
" of *France* might not be scandalized with a method of proceed-
" ing, that seemed contrary to the obedience usually paid to the

however,

however, was a strain of complaisance in the prelates, which *Lewis* was obliged to purchase with the sacrifice of the true interest of *France* to what they demanded in return, namely, the revocation of the edict of *Nantes*, and the persecution of his Protestant subjects, by which multitudes of the most useful of them were driven into other countries; of which false policy *France* hath severely felt the effects.

Such being the malignant effect which Popish principles have upon civil government, even in the hands of arbitrary monarchs, who might be supposed to have the most immediate means of controuling their exorbitant claims and pretensions, it behoves us to consider what might be the consequence of its gaining an establishment in a state whose constitution is founded upon the most generous principles of public liberty, the very

“ see of *Rome*, the Jesuits, in concert with the Archbishop of
 “ *Paris*, resolved to carry on at the same time another design,
 “ that should both clear them of the imputations that might
 “ otherwise have been cast upon them, of designing to divide
 “ *France* from that see, and likewise gratify their hatred of the
 “ Protestants; and so they set on the King to prosecute them
 “ with all the ways both of craft and severity that could be in-
 “ vented; and, by this zeal against *heresy*, they suggested, that
 “ the King might well cover his contests for the *Regale*, which
 “ he pretends is due by the right of the crown.” *Preface*
 to the *History of the Rights of Princes*, &c. p. 42. A Preface
 well worth reading by all Protestants, even by those to whom
 the *History of the Regale* is of no consequence.

idea of which must be totally extinguished, before way can be made for the very lowest of its usurpations ^k.

^k As the civil government of this country hath no points to settle with the Pope, on the subject of distinct powers and privileges, like that of the *Regale* in France, the *active obedience* of *British* and *Irish* Roman Catholics, who pledge no faith or allegiance to a Protestant government, must be wholly engrossed by the *Head of the Church*. Hence it is obvious, that “the
“ *passive submission* of Papists to Protestant civil establishments
“ under which they happen to live,” which has been made an argument by their late apologists for tolerating Popery in *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, is not the effect of their religious principles, but merely of the coercion of our laws. The Pope, as Head of the Church, is alone the Lord and Master of every *British* and *Irish* Papist; and, by the fundamental principles on which his authority is erected, no such Papist must even be passively submissive to a prince or government declared by the said Pope to be *heretical*, without his special dispensation: and how such dispensation must be qualified and limited may be easily conceived. The free toleration of such persons in a Protestant state, can never be justified by any rules of sound policy. But, even granting that the passive submission of every Papist to every civil establishment is the doctrine of the church of Rome, how far ought this principle to recommend the Roman Catholics to their fellow-subjects of the *British* empire? Let this point be decided by one of the latest, but not the least valuable, of our Historians, the incomparable Mrs. *Catharine Macaulay*. “A people whose
“ religious principles teach them active obedience and passive
“ submission to all civil establishments under which they shall
“ happen to live, whether those establishments are introduced
“ by fraud, violence, or common assent, whether calculated for
“ general or partial good, whether tyrannical or legal, may in-
“ deed, as proper tools of iniquity, be looked on with an eye

Our reforming forefathers were perfectly sensible of this, and were proportionably thankful for their deliverance from so destructive a superstition. We of this generation, who contemplate Popery only in historical narrative, or in the twilight of a partial practice, have but a faint and obscure notion of their joy and transport upon its expulsion from this land of liberty, when they found themselves set free from *the Tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities*, as it is well expressed in the Litany of King *Edward VI.* ¹

“of favour by ill-designing governors; but, on this account,
“must be regarded with contempt, jealousy, and aversion, by
“a people who possess the blessings of Liberty, who know its
“value, who are acquainted with the equal rights of men, and
“understand the rational principles of government and sub-
“jection.” Hist. vol. III. p. 78.

¹ “Some hard expressions,” saith Dr. Heylin, “there are of
“him [the Pope] in the Book of Homilies, but none more
“hard than those in the public Litany first published by King
“Henry VIII, at his going to *Boulogne*; and afterwards retained
“in both Liturgies of King *Edward VI*, in which the people
“were to pray for their deliverance from *the tyranny of the*
“*Bishop of Rome and his detestable enormities, &c.* This was
“conceived to be (as indeed it was) a very great scandal and
“offence to all those in the realm of *England* who were well
“affected to the church of *Rome*, and therefore in the Liturgy
“of Queen *Elizabeth* it was quite left out, the better to allure
“them to the divine service of the church, as at first it did.”
Life of Archbishop *Laud*, Introd. p. 19. Dr. *Nicholls* likewise
(the learned Commentator on our Liturgy) calls it a *rough ex-*

It appears, however, from some instances in our History, that the cultivation of this great Blessing came to be neglected much sooner than they, who reflect upon the peace and freedom which a thorough Reformation from Popery should have brought along with it, may be apt to imagine. Some traces of a deviation from the spirit of our first Reformers may be discovered in the reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, and still more in the times of her immediate successors; and to this the mischievous fruits of the religious broils of those times may be very justly ascribed ^m.

pression, Pref. p. vi. It was however, I apprehend, the view of our first Reformers to cure all the subjects of the realm of *England* of their affection for the church of *Rome*, with whose enormities the said Reformers were well acquainted. And if, in the prosecution of this endeavour, they thought *truth* their proper object, rather than *politeness*, who can justly blame them? The event shewed that this expedient, and some others of the same sort, had but little effect in reconciling those who were well affected to the church of *Rome* to the service of the Reformed church of *England*.

^m “The Reformed in these times” (says Mr. *Strype*, under the year 1559) “generally went upon this ground, that, in order to the compleat freeing the church of Christ from the errors and corruptions of *Rome*, every usage and custom practised by that apostate and idolatrous church should be abolished, and that all their ceremonies and circumstances of religious worship should be clearly abrogated; and that the service of God should be most simple, stript of all that shew, comp, and appearance, that had been customarily used before:

The

The injudicious and, in the end, unhappy princes of the house of *Stuart*, had all of them “ esteeming all that to be no better than superstitious and anti-
“ christian.” Life of Archbishop *Grindal*, p. 28. Mr. *Strype* says this upon occasion of *Grindal*’s scrupling the habits, and certain other ceremonies, upon his election to the see of *London*. The scruple arose in the days of K. *Edward VI*, and I cite Mr. *Strype* only as giving an account of the ground of it. The scrupulous in these matters not only found no precedents for things of this kind in the New Testament, but imagined at least that they there found something extremely unfavourable to any attempts to introduce them into Christian worship. Hence they concluded that no human power had authority to injoin them. *Grindal* however submitted, probably on the considerations suggested to him by *Peter Martyr*. But, being a man of great moderation, and, allowing for the circumstances of the times, of liberal sentiments towards those who differed from him, it is not to be supposed that he would be very severe in urging conformity upon others in whom he found the same scruples that himself had once entertained; and from some instances of his lenity towards Dissenters in these matters arose, I conceive, the notion that *he held the reins too loose* in this respect. *Strype*, u. f. p. 301. Archbishop *Whitgift*, who succeeded *Grindal* in the see of *Canterbury*, was of a different turn. He had not the same idea with the Reformed mentioned by *Strype* of the ceremonies established in the church of *England*. It is to be supposed he saw nothing unfavourable to them in the scriptures of the New Testament, and at the same time thought that the church had a *scriptural* authority for injoining them. And thus far, whatever inconvenient dissensions might arise from his strict adherence to these principles, he did not appear, so far as his own judgment was concerned, to desert the Protestant principle of Scripture-authority, though he deviated from the sentiments of the first Reformers on this head, and is said to have given occasion to the Papists to make a perverse use of his principles.

the same mistaken notions of uncontrollable kingly power, and all of them the same views of exalting it at the expence of the legal rights and privileges of their subjects. But the principles of civil and religious liberty collected from the scriptures, which the Reformation had opened, and from the records of the *English* constitution, which began, about the accession of *James I*, to be more diligently examined, gave rise to a patriotic spirit

See his Life by *Strype*, chap. xviii. p. 265. But in the next reign matters were carried to a still greater distance from the original Protestant principle. In the correspondence between King *James I* and Archbishop *Abbot*, concerning the Divorce of the Earl of *Effex*, the Archbishop had laid it down as incontestable, that “The Scripture directly, or by consequence, doth contain in it sufficient matter to decide all controversies, especially in things appertaining to the church.” *Case of the Earl of Effex*, and Lady *Howard*, p. 139. To which the King replied, “This, in my opinion, is *propositio erronea*, and one of the Puritans grounds, without a better distinction or explanation. For the orthodox proposition is, that the Scripture doth directly or by consequence contain in itself sufficient matter to decide all controversies in points of faith and salvation.” *Ibid.* p. 149. Now if ceremonies were not points of faith and salvation, as I think it was pretty generally allowed in those days, it followed from his Majesty’s explanation, that the church had authority to decide controversies relating to those matters, exclusive of the Scripture. And upon this question indeed turned those religious disputes which occasioned so much of the miserable confusion in succeeding times, and which ended so fatally in the next reign.

of

of vigilance, which greatly indisposed the guardians of public liberty for submission to the illegal claims which were made upon themⁿ. Some mistaken principles espoused by particular divines, and inculcated by them, as far as their influence would reach, persuaded these misguided monarchs,

ⁿ Not that the constitution was not well understood in the foregoing reign; or that the patriots of those times were insensible to infringements upon it. The contrary appears by what passed in Queen *Elizabeth's* last parliament concerning monopolies. But this Queen knew how to speak to her parliaments on those occasions, and, as *Rapin Thoyras* observes, “had the good fortune to be believed, because the *English*, in her reign, were in reality the happiest people under the sun. They saw no designs upon their liberties, nor any infringement of their privileges encouraged.” *Hist. of Engl. Tindal's translation*, 8vo, 1731, vol. IX. p. 215. K. *James's* Speech to his first parliament gave a general disgust, and was an early presage of what was to be expected from his notions of government. This, as the same Historian observes, “put the parliament upon their guard,” and consequently upon preparing themselves, by studying the principles of the *English* government with more accuracy, to obviate the claims that the new sovereign might make upon them. A patriotic sentiment is recorded in the *Journals of the House of Commons*, vol. I. p. 156, to have been dropped in a conference with the Lords during this first parliament of King *James*, which Mrs. *Macaulay* (a very competent judge of the political learning of those days) observes, was extraordinary for this time, *Hist.* vol. I. p. 11, and shews that there was room for improvement in the general doctrines of civil government, as well as in those which related more particularly to our constitution. King *James I's* pretensions and attempts promoted the cultivation of both, as appeared by the event.

that the unlimited prerogative of sovereign princes was a doctrine founded upon the scriptures, and consequently must be the doctrine of all Reformed churches. Hence it is that we find so many appeals to the sacred oracles in those things which were spoken and written in favour of arbitrary government on the part of kings, and of absolute submission to it by the people, during the reign of the *Stuart* family °.

° King *James* II amused himself with this conceit to the very last. In his memorial or protestation against what should be done or omitted, in prejudice of his title at the peace of *Ryswick*, addressed to the Protestant princes of *Europe*, he says, “ The princes of the communion of *Augsburgh* are obliged to repair the injury done to their religion, by an act which dishonours it” [meaning his dethronisation]; “ and that they could not better do this than by procuring the re-establishment of a King dethroned contrary to the system of every Protestant communion.” *Histoire de Camisards*, vol. I. p. 18. Mr. *Tindal*, in his *Continuation of Rapin*, vol. XVIII, p. 380, says, that “ King *William* had advice from the *Hague*, that King *James’s* Memorials were so little considered there, that the offering an answer to them would give them some credit, and that, without that, they had none at all.” But the *French* author, from whom I have cited a passage out of one of them, has likewise given us part of the answer which was returned by the princes to whom the appeal was made, to the following purpose. “ That his [King *James’s*] degradation was founded upon his subversion of the fundamental laws of the state, the avenging of which the *English* nation pretended belonged to herself; that such is the constitution of her monarchy; and that every state has its laws, for which it is not answerable to any other state;

But

But when it was found, that Protestants refused to abide by the false and fallacious interpretation of the scriptures, alledged for the support of arbitrary power, and that they appealed to the fa-

“ that he ought to impute the Revolution in *Great-Britain* to
 “ his own ill conduct, or the necessity of the times, of which
 “ the other princes of Christianity, of whatever religion they
 “ should be, had no obligation upon them to change the scene.”

Hist. Camisards, p. 19. As both the Catholic and Protestant princes were, according to my author, unanimous in this answer, it is plain that neither of them thought religion had any thing to do in the business. Passive obedience and non-resistance have been called doctrines of the church of *England* in particular, and such of the members of that church as have opposed the oppressive and illegal measures of the *Stuart*-family have been reproached as deserting the principles of their religion: a reproach which, if it is just, must belong to every member of the church of *England*, who hath pledged his faith and allegiance to the present government. But they who will be at the pains to read Archbishop *Abbot*'s wise and honest reasons for not licensing *Sibthorpe*'s Sermon, *Rushworth*, vol. I. p. 434—444, will readily see that the church of *England* owned no such doctrines, not even from the early days of *James I*, as appears by the censures passed upon Bishop *Harsenet*'s Sermon, *ib.* p. 442. Dr. *Worral*, Chaplain to the Bishop of *London*, was weak enough to license *Sibthorpe*'s sermon, *hand over head*, as the Archbishop expresses it. But afterwards consulting the great *Selden* upon it, he was told by that gentleman, “ that if ever the tide turned,
 “ and matters should be called to a reckoning, he would be
 “ hanged for publishing such a book.” *Rushworth*, *ib.* p. 444. A certain proof that the church of *England* would not patronise the doctrines of it. Some people have been willing to disown the members of the Parliament of 1641, who opposed the arbitrary measures of *Charles I*, for sons of the church of *England*.

cred writings in their turn in justification of their asserting their legal rights and privileges; it became necessary for the purposes then in view, to encourage other principles of religion and civil government, namely, such as might dispose the people to be more pliant to the yoke which the court-sycophants of those days were preparing for them.

For this purpose nothing could be better calculated than the religion of the church of *Rome*, which exacted a blind submission to all her dictates, and which had never refused to lend her aid to civil tyranny, upon condition of being supported, in her turn, by the authority and power of the secular arm. And hence it was that Popery found so much indulgence from King *James I*, and his successor, and that so many endeavours were used by some churchmen of those days, to incorporate the superstitious modes and usages of the church of *Rome* with the public service of the church of *England*, as it was left by the Reformers under Queen *Elizabeth*. Happily the people were aware of the artifice. Their jealousies and apprehensions kept them out of the snare, gave a timely check to the progress Popery was making, and in the end brought down the resentment of an

But this is carrying party-prejudice to an unreasonable length. The maxims of civil Liberty, on which they proceeded at the first, were neither more nor less than the principles of Archbishop *Abbot* abovementioned, exemplified in practice.

irritated

irritated nation upon the heads of those who were the most active in the contrivance.

These, however, were not the last efforts made by the men, who, under the name of Protestants, entertained these principles. The doctrines of passive obedience to the state, and of submission to the authority of the church in its utmost latitude, were, by the means abovementioned, deeply rooted in the minds of considerable numbers, and occasionally brought forth the pernicious fruits of civil oppression, and ecclesiastical persecution. At length, after many struggles and some disappointments, King *James II* found an opportunity of giving the last generation something more than a taste of what was to be expected, if ever Popery should once more become the established religion of *Britain*. On that occasion the eyes of the nation were opened at once; a deliverance was earnestly fought, and, by the blessing of a kind Providence, happily found in the Revolution under the conduct of King *William*, when the enjoyment and security of *British* Liberty were once more restored, and legal provision made, as much as possible, to prevent a return of those evils which Popish principles, backed by temporal power, have never failed to produce.

The penal laws enacted on that occasion against Popery have been called severe, and unreasonable, and some writers, under a Protestant mask at least, have

have seconded the Papists in pleading for a repeal of them. But there are two things which are commonly overlooked by those who frame arguments for such repeal.

1. They who made these laws had an opportunity of contemplating the naked features of Popery, stripped of all disguise. They saw the bitter enmity it bore to the civil and religious rights of mankind, and were consequently better judges of what was necessary for the future security of the *British* constitution, than we of this generation, who, thanks to a kind Providence, have had no such experience.

2. The Papists who have demeaned themselves with any tolerable prudence have had no more to complain of from the severity of these laws, than if they were not obnoxious to them; and even the indiscreet zeal of others of them has been overlooked and connived at, through the lenity of the government, in cases where they have laid themselves sufficiently open, to justify the severest restraints prescribed by law for the safety of the public. Hence we may learn to what degree the pestilent influence of Popish bigotry works upon the human spirit, when even they who are tinctured with it cannot forbear provoking the very government which protects them not only in the peaceable enjoyment of their temporal property, but even in their improvement of it
in

in many cases, equally with those subjects who give the civil magistrate the utmost security for their allegiance^p. Whatever may be thought of this indulgence in a patriotic view, it is greatly for the honour of the Protestant principle of toleration; at the same time that the returns the civil government meets with for it, afford the strongest reasons for not relaxing those necessary provisions which alone prevent the spirit of Popery from proceeding farther than *verbal insults* upon our happy constitution.

^p The fortunes which many Roman Catholics have made, and are still making, in Trade, and in the professions of Physic and Law, are well known, as well as the equal justice they meet with, whenever their property comes under litigation in our courts of Law, and that in cases where more than the interest of a particular subject has been at issue. The statutes relating to the succession of the next Protestant heir to the estate of a Popish recusant, during the life of such recusant, are not often known to have any material operation. And with respect to the right of presentation to benefices in the patronage of Papists, vested, by several statutes, in the two universities of *Cambridge* and *Oxford*, it is not always where the title comes into litigation, that the university's clerk is successful. Whence it appears, that the claimants under Popish Transfers have at least *equal justice*, as those laws are now modified. That the legislature, when these laws were enacted, thought the public highly interested in the objects of them, sufficiently appears from their several *Preambles*; and reason, common sense, and undeniable facts, demonstrate, that they are equally interesting to the public, at this very moment.

To

To give a circumstantial detail of the disturbances this unquiet spirit of Popery hath given to our civil government, from the Revolution to the present times, would carry me to a tedious and a needless prolixity. Large extracts in proof of this perpetual agitation in bigoted minds, that *are like the troubled sea which cannot rest*, might be given from our domestic histories, and to these I must refer such as desire to have a more particular account.

The last defeat of the more open efforts of Popery to overturn our constitution, namely, the suppression of the rebellion in 1746, kept the Roman Catholics for a while in a state of apparent acquiescence. It was necessary, upon such an event, to conceal their sense of that disappointment, that they might not too much exasperate their loyal fellow-subjects, as yet full of a generous resentment for this instance of Popish ingratitude to one of the best of princes. Yet even during this seemingly pacific interval, instances of Popish industry have by accident come to light, secretly at work to prepare the mine, against the time when the forgetfulness of past mischiefs, and inattention to manifest tokens of more in hatching, together with a new succession of men; who, being, for want of experience, unapprised of the genius and spirit of Popery, might be less vigilant over the precious deposit of civil and religious

religious liberty ; should give these dark working engineers an opportunity to spring it^a.

^a See the Appendix N^o III, and a pamphlet intituled, *Mr. A——d's Motives for renouncing the Popish and re-embracing the Protestant Religion, &c.* published in 1758. This publication was incidentally occasioned by the controversy which arose between the late Mr. Bower, author of *The History of the Popes*, and some persons who questioned the sincerity of his conversion from Popery. The controversy is before the public, and it is not to my purpose to meddle with the merits of it, so far as Mr. Bower's integrity was concerned. I beg leave only to make a few observations on some matters of fact, brought to light on the one side and the other, in the course of the debate. Mr. Bower's personal character with respect to the two articles of religion and morals, was, without doubt, of great consequence to himself, and to such of his Protestant friends as had afforded him their countenance and patronage ; and of *some* consequence too to the public, considering him as a writer in defence of the Protestant Reformation ; the less so indeed, as the press was left open to him to make his own particular defence. But this was not of any material importance to the public, in comparison with the nature and extent of the influence the Jesuits appeared to have obtained in this country, and the use and application of those funds of money, of which, by the accounts of both parties, they were then possessed. In Mr. A——d's pamphlet, facts are related, still more alarming to the friends of our Protestant establishment, and these Mr. A—— offered to confirm upon oath. Many persons, about that time, wished that some legal cognisance might be taken of the discoveries made by this gentleman, and that the whole scene of jesuitical traffic, of which so many interesting particulars had transpired upon occasion of this controversy, might be laid open and verified by public authority. It seemed to be a matter of general concern, that a set of men residing in this kingdom, belonging to a religious society, made up of immediate liegemen of the Pope, and sworn enemies to

Such, it is probable, the Roman Catholics and their abettors may esteem the present times to be, if we may judge of their sentiments by their late

the Protestant religion, and to all the patrons and protectors of it, should have a considerable sum of money appropriated to the peculiar uses of their order and mission, and consequently so likely to be employed in such mischievous designs, as this Protestant state has always had reason to apprehend from men of their principles and dispositions. It could not be nothing to the public that these men “ should have their solemn annual assemblies, boast of their numbers, and the *fine appearance* they “ made on those occasions, of the *great good* that they and their “ coadjutors of other orders did in the large and populous city “ of *London*; — that they should triumph and exult upon any “ political events, that seemed to them unfavourable to the interests of *Great Britain*, and even appear in a *military uniform* “ to testify their readiness to enlist with her enemies; — that they “ should make it their common practice to drink treasonable “ healths, with menaces of revenge to the Protestant clergy, and “ others who opposed the views of a Popish Pretender and his “ adherents; and that they should even traduce the ministers “ of state, and many great men of the kingdom, in those times, “ as being of their religion.” *Motives*, p. 58, 59, 60. I say nothing of the crimes imputed to them by Mr. A——d, on account of which, men of all religions are equally amenable to public justice, farther than just to observe that they who palliate such crimes, and screen the criminals upon pretended principles of religion, instead of being tolerated in the open profession of *such* religion, should be expelled from every civil society without the least hesitation. Had these matters of fact been properly traced by authority, immediately upon Mr. A——d's information thus given to the public, some at least of the offenders might probably have been discovered, and dealt with as they deserved; or else (what would have given satisfaction another way) Mr.

increasing

increasing activity and assurance in attempting to make profelytes, and in the apologies that have been made for them in a variety of publications,

A—d might have been convicted as an impostor, who, for some particular interest of his own, thought proper to amuse and alarm the public with mere chimæras and inventions of his own brain.—May I here venture to touch upon another point suggested by this controversy of Mr. *Bower*? It is indeed a tender one, but worthy, in my humble opinion, of a little consideration from the public, in what way, I pretend not to judge. I have been informed, upon the authority of some gentlemen of good sense, and unquestionable honour, that they have, on their travels abroad, found, among the Roman Catholic clergy, men of learning and ingenuous minds, who have freely acknowledged a dissatisfaction with their own system, and at the same time an inclination to take refuge in some Protestant country, where they might freely profess their religious sentiments, provided they could be sure of a subsistence. Might not some public provision for the maintenance of such converts be made without any impropriety, at least till, by some particular application of their respective talents, they might be made useful to themselves and the community, without such expence to the public? Some establishment of this kind, wisely and cautiously conditioned, seems to me to bid the fairest for obviating, on the one hand, the complaints that have been made, that such conversions have not been sufficiently encouraged in this country, and, on the other, the reasonable jealousy that particular persons, especially in high stations, may entertain that their benevolence would be disappointed, and their patronage disgraced by the tergiversation of an Hypocrite or a Renegado. I find in a pamphlet, published in the year 1748, intituled, *An Enquiry into the Behaviour of our great Churchmen since the Reformation, &c.* the following passage. “When there
“are any of their missionaries” [meaning Roman Catholics]

particularly in news-papers; in which undoubtedly their policy, as children of this generation,

“who, by reading, conversation, and probity of mind, are
 “disposed to become converts to our church, how unhappy and
 “dismal are their circumstances? They are sure of feeling all
 “possible effects of the malice and revenge of the party they
 “desert, and have the discouraging prospect of neglect, coldness,
 “and suspicion, with which we have thought fit to treat such
 “converts. With a very few exceptions, this hath generally
 “been the case ever since the Revolution:” p. 21. Surely this
 writer, whoever he was, should have supported this peremptory
 reflection by a competent number of instances, on the peril of
 being held injurious to his countrymen. That the party de-
 serted by such converts hath molested them more or less by attempts
 either to bring them back, or to expose them to some hardship
 or scandal, is perhaps true in the case of every churchman who
 hath been converted from the Popish to the Protestant religion.
 But, so far as I have been able to observe, or to learn from en-
 quiry, *coldness, neglect, or unreasonable suspicion*, towards such
 converts, has not been justly or generally chargeable upon the
 present generation of *British* Protestants. There are and have
 been many remarkable examples to the contrary, among which
 the learned and respectable Dr. *Courayer* has a right to be first
 named. Father *Piazza* I personally knew at *Cambridge*. I
 have heard him acknowledge his obligations to particular pa-
 trons, and was an eye-witness of the regard paid him in the
 university, where, while I knew him, he procured himself a
 comfortable subsistence by teaching the Italian language. Dr.
Aspinwall had nothing to complain of, unless some groundless
 suspicions, which however did not prevent his enjoying a good
 preferment to the day of his death. I remember a venerable
 old clergyman of the name of *Aylmer*, beneficed in *Lancashire*,
 who was a convert from Popery, and much respected and
 esteemed in that country, as long as he lived. There are others,
 no doubt, in the same circumstances, still living, who have no

is

is to be commended. The short rescripts conveyed to the public through these channels, in the form of Letters, seem to be calculated to make impressions

reason to complain either of the coldness or neglect they meet with in this country. But the most singular instance of favour to converts from Popery, to our purpose, is that of the late Bishop *Hoadley*, who being himself convinced of the sincerity of the sincerity of *Pillioniere's* conversion, would not withdraw his patronage from him, notwithstanding the suspicions expressed of the said *Pillioniere*, and the reflections cast upon the Bishop for entertaining him, by those who so warmly opposed his Lordship's principles. That proper caution should be used in giving credit or encouragement to converts from Popery, particularly ecclesiastics, no one can deny, who recollects the instances of *Anthony de Dominis*, *Jarrige*, and others both at home and abroad. Stronger or more convincing marks of real conversion could hardly be given by men, than were exhibited in the writings of these two revolters: and whoever after these proofs of their conversion to the Protestant religion should have questioned their sincerity, must have been thought, by every equitable mind, utterly void of all Christian charity. That some of the pretended converts from Popery in these latter times have not been at all fitter to be trusted than these two, may be conjectured from some particulars in the late Lord Bishop of *Winchester's* Letter, concerning his Lordship's affair with *Bernard Fournier*. I do not mention Mr. *Bower's* case as an authority one way or other. Great undoubtedly was his indiscretion in what is called his money-transaction with the Jesuits, which however, as the Jesuits are now so well known to have been traders in all kinds of merchandise, ought not to pass for more than it will fairly prove. But, however the matter might be taken by different parties while the litigation was on foot, every suspicion of Mr. *Bower's* halting between the two religions ought now to subside. Mr. *Bower* died a sincere and pious Protestant,

upon a greater variety of readers, than arguments deduced in long and formal treatises, which are neither to be had at so easy an expence, nor so readily and generally dispersed among those who are most likely to be influenced by them.

I do not mention it as a circumstance to be regretted, that Popish writers have had this free ac-

of which a complete and satisfactory attestation was given to the public by his respectable Relict, in the *London Chronicle* of October 11, 1766. — Upon the whole, might not some Asylum be provided, at the expence of the public, for such Romish Ecclesiastics as are disposed to come over to us, with a temporary subsistence, till they could be properly employed in particular stations? Might not this Asylum be considered as a place of *probation*, till these Refugees could procure proper and satisfactory credentials of their former behaviour, and give sufficient proof of their sincerity in embracing the Protestant religion? I ask these questions with absolute deference to better judgments, and only by way of suggesting something of an expedient to take away all occasion for any complaints of *neglect* on the one hand, and for any jealousies on the other, with respect to such Refugees. The Roman Catholics leave nothing short which may either distress or calumniate those who forsake their superstition. One curious method the Papists in *Ireland* take for this purpose hath been signified in a late ingenious publication. It seems, they call renouncing the Romish, and embracing the Protestant faith, *swallowing the scorpion*. An expression well enough calculated to intimidate tender and superstitious minds. See *Thoughts, Essays, &c.* by C. HOWARD, Esq; p. 11. Let us take the hint to counteract this policy, by giving all possible encouragement to serious and sincere converts from the church of *Rome*.

cess to our public prints. Such liberty can never turn out to the disadvantage of the Protestant cause, provided its advocates may be fairly heard in their turn, and have liberty to answer in the same way ^q.

^q “What! (will the reader say) can it be made a question, “whether Protestant writers may have free access to *English* “News-papers, in defence of the established religion?” Let him judge for himself, after perusing the following particulars. In the *Gazetteer* of February 13, 1767, was a notification from the publishers of that paper in these words: “*The two letters concerning the PAPISTS, signed IMPARTIAL, we beg to be excused inserting; as we have very PARTICULAR REASONS for rejecting (for the future) every thing relative to POPERY.*”—What might be the particular subject of the letters signed IMPARTIAL does not appear; they might be *for*, or they might be *against*, Popery. But the determination, *to reject every thing relative to Popery*, extended the proscription to protestant as well as popish advocates for their respective systems. As this must have been matter of some surprise to the public, somebody, it seems, thought proper to call upon the publishers of the Newspaper for those *particular reasons*, mentioned in the notice above-cited. To which, in the *Gazetteer* of Saturday, February 21, 1767, the following answer was returned: “*After mature deliberation, we must beg to be excused inserting the letter signed A PROTESTANT (occasioned by our notice of “declining, for particular reasons, any more letters about Popery”)* for fear of giving offence. Here we have a glimpse of the *particular reasons*, &c. namely, *the fear of giving offence*. But to whom could the letter of A PROTESTANT give offence, on the subject of Popery? To none but Papists or their favourers. To what a pass must we be come, while the Papists have sufficient interest to controul the *British Press*, when writings in opposition to their principles and superstition are offered for publication, and to *intimidate* our printers with the consequences of giving them offence. It

Nor indeed have the Roman Catholics been negligent in improving this liberty to their own advantage, by such kind of art and management as the feebleness of their cause required. They have accordingly brought to these conflicts a double portion of assurance to bear them out in contradicting the most authentic historical facts, as well as of jesuitical chicane whereby to evade the scandal of their detestable principles.

The champion who hath figured in this periodical warfare with the greatest parade, is one who, under the signature of *A Real Freethinker*, and with some equivocal efforts to pass himself upon the world for a *Protestant*, or at least for no *Papist*, published a series of Letters in one of the Daily News-papers, wherein the cause of Popery was glossed over with as plausible a varnish, as a little acquaintance with such writers as Cardinal *Perron* and the Bishop of *Meaux* could furnish; and that too, oftentimes, weakened by the *Freethinker's* own *modifications*, the compounded produce of a confused head, and a conscious heart^r.

ought however to be mentioned, in justice to the publishers of the *Gazetteer*, that they have since got over their scruples, and exhibited several interesting letters on the Protestant, as well as the Popish side of the question.

^r The Daily paper in which the *Real Freethinker's* essays were retailed, was the *Public Ledger*; the publishers of which, to their honour, admitted several answers, which exposed, with great spirit and solidity, the dull malignant sophistry of the essayist;

But

But I must here observe that our present controversy with the Papists does not turn, as heretofore, so much upon those theological points which distinguish the Protestant from the Popish religion, as upon the merits of a particular question, namely, whether, *upon Protestant principles*, the Roman Catholics, as they affect to stile themselves, are not intitled to as full and free a Toleration in *Great Britain*, as other sects or churches, who dissent from the Ecclesiastical Establishment.

and at length drove him to the necessity of taking up the cause under a different signature, which gave him an opportunity of contradicting himself, without the reproach of inconsistency: and when that would not screen him from his pursuers, he thought fit to drop the News-paper-contest, and to collect his *real freethinking* letters into a pamphlet, under the title of *A Free Examination of the common Methods employed to prevent the Growth of Popery*, where, by way of an *Introduction* and *Notes*, he had an opportunity of *mangling, garbling*, and variously *falsifying* and *misrepresenting* those who had written against him, at his leisure; in which he hath been detected, and very properly chastised by an excellent hand in the *London Chronicle*, under the name of *Old Milton*; as likewise by some others. “We must however” (to borrow the language of Dr. Middleton) “allow these men to
“act like generous adversaries, in referring the merit of their
“arguments to the trial of the Press; which, in all countries
“where it can have its free course, will ever be found the surest
“guardian of right and truth, and to which this particular country, among the many great blessings which it enjoys, is manifestly indebted for one of the greatest, *its deliverance from a
“Popish slavery*; as all our Histories testify, from the Reformation down to this day.”—And for this very reason, when these men or their abettors pretend to *controul* the Press, as in the instance, note 9, it is high time to check their insolence.

This debate has been very artfully brought on. The grand objection to the Toleration of Popery is merely of the *civil* kind; that is to say, the tendency of their tenets to subvert the *civil* as well as the *religious* rights of mankind in general, and in particular the security we of this country have for our civil and religious liberties, under those laws upon which the protestant settlement of our present government depends.

If this could be proved to be a mere *prejudice*, and if it could be shewn that the doctrine and discipline of the church of *Rome* had no such tendency; but that, on the contrary, a good Papist was bound by his religion to be as obedient and peaceable a subject to a Protestant as to a Popish Government, the great Protestant Principle of *tolerating all sects, whose doctrines do not interfere with the peace and order of the civil government*, must take place with respect to Popery, equally as with respect to any other sect. And accordingly the matter of fact being presupposed, these popish writers have, with all freedom, urged the Protestants with the consequences of their own principles, and, as they have occasionally expressed themselves, *turned the tables upon them*^s.

^s But as there is nothing more difficult than for Popery to wear the mask of moderation for any long time, it appeared by an incidental discovery, that they wanted to *turn the tables* upon us with a witness. The case was this: The great popular reproach which the Papists and Jacobites cast upon King *William*, and which they found made the strongest impression upon the

The

The author who made the most of this kind of argument, was one who called himself a Protestant, and under that *candid* appearance published a book, intitled, *The Trial of the Roman Catholics*

common people, was, that he was A FOREIGNER; an objection to which the supposed son of *James II* was not liable. To ridicule this idle and mischievous distinction, *Daniel de Foe* published his famous satire called *The True-born Englishman*. What reception this poem and its author met with in their day need not be mentioned. This prejudice of the people, however, continued to be managed and fomented *occasionally* by the disaffected, against the two first Princes of the House of *Brunswick* during the time they filled the throne of *Great-Britain*. All this while the *True-born Englishman* was alive and merry with his Holiness at *Rome*. Upon the demise of his late Majesty, our present most gracious Sovereign *George III* succeeded to the imperial crown of these realms, who, being born among us, silenced, to the great mortification of the Papists and Jacobites, the malevolent objection which had been made to his illustrious ancestors on account of their foreign birth. On *January 1, 1766*, died the old *Chevalier*, leaving his *pretensions* (not alas! to a *True-born Englishman*, but) to a native of *Italy*. The *True-born Englishman* was now happily in possession, and the popish *Aspirant* a foreigner, and liable to all the objections which the party had thrown upon our Glorious Deliverer on that account. Now therefore was the time for them *to turn the tables*, and the opportunity was not to be lost. Immediately they republished *De Foe's* Satire on the *True born Englishman*, printed, as is said in the title-page, for *R. Richards*, next the *Cross-Keys Tavern, Holbourn, 1765*; which however did not make its appearance *publicly* till after the demise of the old *Chevalier*. But lest the *design* of this publication should be mistaken, they took care to prefix to the poem a print of a young personage, who, though without a name, was sufficiently described by the adjoining *insignia*, namely, a shield, charged with the arms of the *Sobieski*-family, with this

of IRELAND; wherein the writer's point was, to exculpate the *Irish* Papists from the guilt of the horrid Massacre of Protestants in 1641. And the conclusion in view was, that the *Irish* Papists, standing acquitted as to the fact, the motives upon which those inhuman butcheries were committed, and the principles upon which they have been supposed to be vindicated, were wrongfully ascribed to the doctrines of Popery; which, according to this writer, are perfectly consistent with the profoundest submission to civil government, even when administered by those whom the church of *Rome* esteems to be Heretics^t.

motto, *Sequi finemque tueri*. Underneath the shield is the bust of *Charles I*, and at the bottom the following verses:

“ Few know my face, tho' all men do my fame;
 “ Look strictly, and you'll quickly guess my name.
 “ Thro' desarts, snows, and rain, I made my way;
 “ My life was daily risqu'd to gain the day.

“ *I make no promises to those that keep none.*”

The copy from which these particulars are taken, and which is now before me, was bought at a popish bookseller's in *January*, 1766, as soon, it is believed, as any of them were exposed to sale. Be this as it may, we have here pretty strong evidence what the Papists mean by *turning the tables* upon us.

^t The just and acute strictures of Mrs. *Macaulay* upon this artful performance, vol. III. of her excellent History, are sufficient to expose it to the contempt of the public, without any farther remarks. The same topic has been taken up by the Author of the *Free Examination* above mentioned, with a particular virulence against a writer in the *Public Ledger*, who signed

About

About the same time (that the Papists of *England* might not lose the benefit of the pleadings

himself F. W. and who, by that, and some other circumstances, seems to be the learned Dr. *Ferdinando Warner*, whose *History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland* hath indeed, in some instances, seasonably confronted the *Real Freethinker* (metamorphosed into a *Citizen of the World*), on the subject of the *Irish* Massacre. But if the said *Citizen* is not satisfied with the gentle manner in which the doctor hath represented these matters, he must be hard to please. For tho' the learned Historian hath observed, that, before the Rebellion broke out, the Papists had "nothing to fear from the administration, and no animosities as to interest or religion appeared to subsist among them; without the least pretence of a quarrel, or the apprehension of any hostility by the Protestants," (which seems to be cause of the *Citizen's* intemperate wrath against F. W.) yet the Citizen must be very unreasonable if he is not appeased by Dr. *Warner's* moderation, who permits himself to doubt whether Sir *Phelim O'Neil's* cruelties, committed in the progress of the Rebellion, "should leave any stain upon his religion." *Hist.* p. 106. This, surely, leaves the field open to this *Real Freethinking Citizen*, to prove, at his leisure, and *after his own manner*, that neither the interests nor the principles of Popery had any concern in the *Irish* Rebellion from the beginning to the end of it. The Papists, who are more than commonly zealous at this period to wash the bloody stains from their predecessors of 1641, know very well what they mean by it, and others are no strangers to the end they aim at. But it had much better become their present pretensions, to have generously condemned the cruelty of their forefathers, and, by declaring their abhorrence of such practices, to have convinced those into whom they desire to instill a better opinion of their religious and political principles, that those principles are now very different from what they were in the days of *Charles I.* By taking the contrary course, and attempting to discredit the plainest and most authentic facts by incompetent evidence, they have gained nothing but the reproach

in

in the *Trial*) appeared a pamphlet, intituled, *Considerations on the Penal Laws against Roman*

of a shameful inconsistency, while apologizing for the outrages of the *Irish* Papists in forty-one, by the provocations they received from the government, they destroy that argument for their farther toleration, which rests upon the supposition, that their religion is calculated to promote absolute passive submission under every sort of government; and shew us in the most glaring light, that *Popery is still the same*, wearing the mask of peace and gentleness no longer than an opportunity offers to use the instruments of zeal and vengeance against those Heretics who for the present may have them in subjection, by the force of laws, and the advantage of numbers; which accordingly we find it is their aim and their policy to lessen as fast as they can, by numerous conversions to their superstition. But even this vizard of decency and prudence will only fit the countenances of the better-bred Roman Catholics. The popish vulgar are less scrupulous in avowing their spleen and enmity against both the government and religion of Protestants; and are, generally speaking, open enough to acknowledge that they owe their sentiments on these subjects to the pious instructions of the very same priests whose ministrations are attended indifferently by the rich as well as the poor. The indiscretion, indeed, of the ruder and less refined herd, the better sort of Roman Catholics are obliged to disown on critical occasions. A notable instance of which we have in a pamphlet ascribed (against a hundred probabilities to the contrary) to the Lord Viscount *Taafe*, entitled, *Observations on Affairs in Ireland from the Settlement in 1691 to the present time*. The question was, whether the Irish Catholics were under any engagements to join Mr. *Conflans*, in case his projected descent upon *Ireland* in 1759 had taken place. To prove that they were not, their Addresses to the Lord Lieutenant are referred to; but as it had appeared that the Irish Catholics *had early intelligence of the design* of the French Admiral (a sort of intelligence, by the way, which is not usually first sent to people of the lowest class), and were thereupon disposed to triumph and insult, this

Catholics

Catholics in England, and the new-acquired Colonies in AMERICA; in a Letter to a noble Lord,

affair of *addressing* became but a kind of equivocal proof of loyalty, when set against facts, of which there had been so many witnesses. Something therefore must be said to these facts, or all was over with this argument, and that is thus ordered in the pamphlet, p. 18. “What a few desperate men might hope from such an event, and what they would have done in consequence of its taking place, is *here out of the question*.” By no means, till it is shewn that these *desperate* men were not *Roman Catholics*, and that they had not both their *intelligence* and their *hope* from *Roman Catholics* less desperate than themselves. Till that is cleared up, these circumstances are not *laid out of the question*, but *begged*, as a main part of it, which however we cannot agree to grant. Under this reprobation of *desperate men*, are the *attempts* and *intentions* of the gentry called *White-Boys*, endeavoured to be shifted from the more respectable Irish Roman Catholics, p. 20, 21, of this same pamphlet; probably enough with some success among the *credulous* English. But what the well-affected Irish Protestants thought of it, the reader may judge by an authentic paper in the *Appendix*, N^o IV. The pamphlet before me informs us in a note, p. 20, that “A *Candid Inquiry* on this subject was then in the press, and would speedily be published, and to that the noble Author [*or his Amanuensis*] refers.” This pamphlet hath since appeared under the title of *A candid Enquiry into the Causes and Motives of the late Riots in the Province of Munster in Ireland, by the People called White-Boys or Levellers; with an Appendix containing other papers on the same subject, in a Letter to a noble Lord in ENGLAND*. This pamphlet I have read, and must think, either that his Lordship had never perused it, or that he was very ill advised, when he referred to it. To pass by this Enquirer’s assurance in representing the circumstances in the case of *Nicholas Sheehy* the Priest and his accomplices, as more favourable towards proving their innocence, than those in the case of the French Protestant *Calas*, [Pref.] and thereby preferring the *equity* of that execrable pro-

I

by

by a Country Gentleman. It must be acknowledged that there is, in this pamphlet, much more tem-

secution to the Justice of *Ireland* in the condemnation of *Bridge's* murderers.——To pass by his modest request to his correspondent, to believe no body but the *Enquirer* himself,—he hath totally deprived *Sheehy* the Priest of the benefit of Lord *Taafe's* apology, of being one of *a few desperate men*, &c. by an Extract from *Exshaw's Magazine* for *April* 1766, at pag. 58 of his pamphlet; where we are informed that *Sheehy* “enjoyed an income of two “hundred pounds a year.” In the same page we are told that *Sheehy* the Priest “appeared in the character of a plain man, “free from design.” But this the pamphleteer himself forbids us to believe, and characterises him as “a giddy, officious, but “not ill-meaning man, with something of a *Quixotish* cast of “mind, towards the relieving of all those, whom he fancied to “be injured or distressed,” p. 7. Circumstances tending to induce the strongest probability of his being capable of undertaking every thing laid to his charge. And as to his *meaning*, it could not be *ill*, where it was directed by a zeal for his religion. Pag. 19. this consistent *Enquirer* pretends to be a Protestant: “Our religion, my Lord, *says he*, derives no benefit from the “imposing on Papists opinions which are manifestly inconsistent “with their *avowed* and most *essential* tenets.” But a Protestant of common reading would have known, that the *avowed* and the *essential* tenets of Popery are two very different things, as hath appeared to the whole world in the case of *Bossuet* Bishop of *Meaux*, and from the moral tenets of the Jesuits; a matter of fact which invalidates the whole force of his inferring the innocence of the sufferers, either from their principles or their dying protestations. In short, the very abstract of their trials, exhibited in the Appendix of this curious performance, exculpates the Judge and Jury who tried them from every the least suspicion of partiality or undue prejudice; as might be shewn by going into particulars. The repeated and consistent evidence of *John Lon-dergan* or *Lonergan*, the boy of 19, is remarkable. For this boy's evidence *no stews were raked, no gaols rummaged, nor*
per

per and civility than in any others that have appeared on that side the question. No art or ad-

was he found to be *a stranger to the persons of the accused*, when confronted at their trial, p. 23. For “the court indulged the
 “prisoners to change their dress before *Loneragan* swore to the
 “identity of their persons; who, notwithstanding their disguise,
 “and their being mixed with a number of people, pointed them
 “out with the cryer’s staff.” p. 57. *Pendergraft’s* evidence, in
 favour of the prisoners, is totally overthrown by *Tennison*, p. 55.
 “The evidence of *James Herbert* for the crown, was very
 “circumstantial, and was not attempted to be invalidated, ei-
 “ther in regard to his testimony or his character,” p. 56. But
Edmond Sheehy declares, “he never saw *Herbert* till the day of
 “his trial,” p. 63. Perhaps not in a pair of leathern breeches,
 or a blue coat, or not in a court of justice. But *Edmond Sheehy*
 could hardly be a stranger to *Herbert’s* errand to the assizes,
 namely, to give evidence on the behalf of his accom-
 plice *Nicholas*. At least our candid Enquirer was no stranger to
 it, when he attempted to vilify this man, p. 13. of his pam-
 phlet. But does he consider that the more black he makes
Herbert, the more suspicions he creates of the sort of witnesses
 picked up in behalf of his favourite *Sheehy* the priest? This was
 probably the prudential consideration, which restrained *Edmond*
Sheehy’s council from any attempt to invalidate *Herbert’s* testi-
 mony on *Edmond’s* trial, and *Edmond* himself from making use
 of that circumstance, of never seeing *Herbert* before, till he was
 just going to execution. And yet, possibly, that very supposition
 would have overthrown every thing *Herbert* had to say in favour
 of Father *Sheehy*, had his evidence been received on the be-
 half of that priest. One might bring many more instances of
 this *Candid Enquirer’s* self-confutation, which, for the avoiding
 of prolixity, must be omitted. One remark, however, I can-
 not pass by, upon the sub-enquiry of the public-spirited and pro-
 testant-hearted M. S. Esq; exhibited in the Appendix, p. 25.
 “The persons [meaning the rioters of 1762] were Papists, and
 “the violence broke out in the time of war. As Papists, we
 dress

dress is wanting to conciliate the minds of *English* Protestants either to the spirit or the principles of

“ know them hurried on by a blind religious zeal, and believe
 “ them, in general, as different from Protestants in political as
 “ religious sentiments. We are not quite mistaken in this
 “ judgment of them ; but we are often widely so in the con-
 “ sequence we attempt to draw from it ; That they are ever
 “ ripe, for rebellion, and if any opportunity offered, would mas-
 “ sacre us in our beds,” p. 27. But surely there could be no
wide mistake in attempting to draw the consequences mentioned
 in the present case. “ The *Irish* Papists, in general, are hur-
 “ ried on by a blind religious zeal, and are as different in po-
 “ litics from Protestants as in religion.” That is to say, they
 are equally hurried by a *blind zeal* in politics as religion. These
Irish Papists turn riotous at a time when the protestant govern-
 ment is at war with a popish enemy, and when the said Papists
 [p. 29] might have expected a foreign aid. What hinders us
 then from concluding, that these rioters of 1762 (and the pre-
 sent question concerns these only) were ripe for rebellion, or
 who can pretend to say, what they would *not* have done, urged
 on by these principles and dispositions, if a farther opportunity
 had offered ? Upon the whole, nothing could have been more
 unfortunate for the *Observations* ascribed to Lord *Taafe*, than
 the publication of this pamphlet, upon which so much of the
 credit of the *Observations* is made to depend. That the better
 sort of Roman Catholics kept fair with government both in
England and *Ireland*, during all the various disturbances given
 by the *White Boys*, is neither to be doubted nor wondered at :
 nor was it adviseable for the government to discover what sen-
 timents they entertained of all those professions of Roman Ca-
 tholic loyalty, on *all* occasions. But what those sentiments
 were, appeared sufficiently at a proper time ; namely, in the
 Lord *Lieutenant's* admirable Speech to the *Irish* parliament,
October 1763, part of which I shall here transcribe, as a full
 answer to so much of the pamphlets above-noted as relates to
 the case of the rioters in 1759, 1762, and 1763. “ No means
 Popery ;

Popery; but the Protestants of the church of *England* more particularly, by shewing that the whole form and fashion of that church is borrowed from the *Roman*, to which, as this writer will have it, the church of *England* is indebted even for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament; besides other articles of consequence to our present ecclesiastical constitution, which are there particularly enumerated ^u.

“ can serve more effectually to prevent these disorders for the
 “ future, than the encouragement of such institutions as tend
 “ to impress on the minds of the lower order of people, early
 “ habits of industry, and TRUE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGION.
 “ For this purpose your PROTESTANT CHARTER SCHOOLS
 “ were established; to which I THEREFORE recommend the
 “ continuance of your care, encouragement, and support.”

This, I suppose, is decisive, and sufficient to shew in what degree *false principles of religion* (which, by the way, are not peculiar to the lower order of people) were understood by the government to contribute to those disorders.

^u This enumeration is as follows; “ The clergy of the established church, received the sacred deposit of the Old and New Testaments from their Roman Catholic predecessors. It is from them also they are *ambitious* of deriving their mission and ordination; and the labours of Father Courayer for that purpose, have been received with applause. Every positive article of belief is, in a manner, taken from the Roman Catholic faith; and besides the Holy Bible, the rule of that faith remains in part the same, as the Apostles Creed, the Athanasian Creed, the four first General Councils, and a regard for the authority of the antient fathers of the church. There is also nearly the same *Hierarchy*, the orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and the like canons for fixing the subordination and ecclesiastical discipline; the same books
 But,

But, whatever artifice this dextrous advocate may have thrown into this insidious composition,

“ are put into the hands of the laity ; *The Whole Duty of Man,*
 “ *Thomas a Kempis, The Introduction to a devout Life,* and many
 “ books of that sort, translated by Dr. Stanhope, and other emi-
 “ nent divines. Likewise, the having a set form of public
 “ prayer, and *very little variation in the prayers themselves,* ex-
 “ cept the difference of language, and what regards the inter-
 “ cession of saints. The more minute or ceremonial part
 “ of the former worship has also been preserved ; the particu-
 “ lar and decent garb of ecclesiastics, the use of the surplice,
 “ of the sign of the cross in baptism, bowing at the name of
 “ *Jesus.* The same days are allotted for commemorating the
 “ mysteries of the Christian religion, organs, bells, and even
 “ the placing the communion-table, the situation of which
 “ was regulated several different ways in *Edward the VIth's*
 “ reign ; but when the church of *England* was established, it
 “ was fixed in the old place, and restored by *some* to its more
 “ solemn name of altar. This similitude, I suppose, gave oc-
 “ casion to the church of *England's* being styled *Calvino-pa-*
 “ *pista,* by the *German Lutherans.* The calvinistical part is
 “ very much forsaken, and the gloomy predestinarian system
 “ is exchanged for a more chearful and reasonable doctrine.”

Considerations, p. 63, 64, 65. Thus we see even this artful writer, while he is soliciting a favour from our rulers, cannot resist the temptation of sneering the church of *England*, for her conformity to popery in so many material articles. It is indeed a clumsy banter enough, and so expressed, as to place *bells* and *organs* among the mysteries of the Christian Religion. But it is a representation well adapted to the capacity of the vulgar, and is of no small use to the Papists (to my certain knowledge) in their work of *Conversion.* A circumstance which requires our most serious attention ; and more especially as the want of these *Conformities* among the protestant dissenters,

he labours in common with the rest of his fellow-drudges in the same cause, under the incurable infirmity of inconsistency and misrepresentation in matters of fact^x. It could indeed hardly be other-

give them the advantage of *alleging* at least, that for one convert to Popery gained from them, there are hundreds won from the church of *England*.

^x Thus “ the Protestants burnt in Queen *Mary's* reign, were “ guilty of *Treason*. The Gunpowder-conspirators were *few*— “ acted confessedly *against* catholic principles, and expressed “ their sorrow and repentance for it at their execution. In the “ *Irish* Massacre none but the *lowest class of people* were guilty “ of the cruelties complained of on that occasion.” But as there were facts upon which our *Considerer* could not wholly depend, he has another string to his bow, and, according to former precedents, “ ascribes the Powder-plot to the artifices of “ *Cecil*, the *Irish* Rebellion to the frenzy of men made desperate “ by the oppressions of civil government, and the Tyranny of “ *James II* to the counsels of Lord *Sunderland*.” But the pinch of the case lay here: All these attempts for the suppression of Heresy were, in the event, *unsuccessful*, save only that of Queen *Mary*, and she acted *by Law*. “ The principal persons who suffered in Queen *Mary's* reign,” says this gentleman, “ might “ have been punished for *high treason*, but she chose to have them “ condemned for *heresy*, that so the punishment might fall on “ those *she deemed* the enemies of the Almighty, rather than con- “ sider them as offenders against herself and the state,” p. 20. SHE *deemed*! Did not the church *deem* them so too? were not the laws then in force against *Heresy* in this kingdom? are not the laws *still* in force in all Roman Catholic countries against *Heresy* founded upon the same principle? “ But Cardinal *Pole*—disap- “ proved of all violent proceedings.” Why then did he not put a stop to them? (for he certainly had it in his power.) And what does this prove, but that, whatever the natural disposition of the Man might be, the principles of Holy Church admit of no lenity in cases of Heresy; and the principles of Holy Church must be

wise with any of them, when one considers the paradox they have to support, which is at the

the principles of the Priest.—“As all *English* Catholics do at
 “this time,” says this *Considerer*. But why *English* Catholics?
 Are not *English* Catholics of the same religion with *French*, *Spanish*, *Italian*, *German*, *Irish* Catholics? Have they different notions of *Heresy*, or different sentiments of the Authority of the church by which *Heresy* is defined and censured? If so, what becomes of the *Unity* of the church?—But here again the reason is at hand; if *English* Catholics were to avow their approbation of *violent proceedings*, their wickedness might come to fall on their own pate, as it hath done on former occasions. But what does this gentleman mean by *violent proceedings*? When *Lewis XIV* was *dragooning* his Protestant subjects into the Catholic faith, by all the barbarities implied in that expressive word, the *French* writers had the assurance to affirm, that all their conversions were made by *methods of lenity and sweetness*, and that no severities were used upon those occasions. Among others, *Bossuet* Bishop of *Meaux* asserted this in a Pastoral Letter to the new converts of his diocese in 1685. But, glaring and notorious matters of fact having given the lie to his representation, it was expected that he would expunge that passage in the 2d edition of the said letter. “They write from *Paris*,” says Mr. *Bayle*, “that Mr. *de Meaux* will cancel, in the 2d edition of his Pastoral
 “Letter, the passage where he says to the new Catholics of his
 “Diocese, *that they have suffered no violence in their goods or in*
 “*their persons*, and that he has heard other Bishops say the same
 “thing.” *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres*, Juin. 1616. p. 736. Instead of this, the Bishop, in another piece, published soon after, solemnly called God to witness, that he had, in that Pastoral Letter, spoken nothing but the truth. (See *Bower’s Summary View*, p. 149.) Which is no otherwise to be understood, consistently with the credit and veracity of this Catholic Prelate, but by supposing that in his ideas the methods of *dragooning* were *not* methods of *violence*. In what high estimation the Bishop of *Meaux*’s sentiments are held by the *English* Catholics, hath ap-
 bottom

bottom neither more nor less than that *the penal laws against Papists in Great Britain have for their*

peared in many of their late publications; we shall therefore do them no wrong in supposing their ideas of *violent proceedings* to be the same with those of this Prelate. But the point this writer wants to infuse into the present generation, without any proof but a few examples of changes of sentiments in similar cases, is the tender affection the Catholics have for his present Majesty. It is a great pity he did not bring, as an instance of it, their republishing *The True-born Englishman*, with the decorations above-mentioned. One of his arguments is as follows: "Not many
" years ago, one of the Universities was branded with the charge
" of being *paved with Jacobites*; and yet, in how high a degree
" of royal favour do the members of that body seem to stand at
" present?" Well, and what then? Why then, "there are many
" other instances of the like changes." Therefore, I suppose, the Roman Catholics ought to stand in an equally high degree of Royal Favour. Have then the Roman Catholics changed their *political sentiments*, as he insinuates the members of the University to have done? That, with all his flourishes "of the
" sensibility of his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, of his
" goodness, clemency, and moderation," he ventures not to assert. There is no consequence then to be drawn from this supposed parallel case, in favour of the Roman Catholics; and the only use he could possibly make of the instance he here brings, would be the supposition, that the University seems to stand in this high degree of Royal Favour, without changing her political sentiments. And whether this would be a more decent compliment to his Majesty's Government or to the University, the reader will judge. Upon the whole, all insinuations of their affection to his Majesty's person and government, are but mere pretence, while his Majesty's religion lies with them under the imputation of Heresy, and that Heresy is excluded by the church from toleration. This writer endeavours indeed to represent this matter otherwise, and tells us, p. 3, that, "except in the

object opinions purely religious, whereas what the Protestants call persecutions under Popish Govern-

“ extremities of *Europe, Spain, and Sweden*, the benign spirit of
 “ moderation is gaining ground.” Unfortunate apologist! the
 vengeance so lately attempted to be taken on Mr. *Marmontel* in
France, by the Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, for his noble sentiments
 on *Toleration*, in the 15th chapter of his *Belisarius*, too visibly
 confute the supposition. “ Mr. *Marmontel*, say the accounts
 “ from *Paris*, in a letter to the Archbishop, offered to retract it
 “ [this 15th chapter], if necessary; but the Divines are inex-
 “ orable, and are determined on proceeding against him.” *Lond.*
Chronicle, Apr. 4, 1767. Will our *Considerer* tell us, that these are
 bigots, who act both against reason and principle? Hardly; for
 they are Priests, and their authority is sacred with every one of
 their persuasion, even by the confession of this very writer. For
 in answer to those who ridicule the Papists for sacrificing their
 reason to the authority of the Priest, he does not deny the charge,
 but apologizes for it thus: “ In this they [the Papists] act much
 “ in the same manner as the rest of mankind in their most im-
 “ portant concerns; the client is directed by his lawyer in what
 “ regards his property, and makes so little use of his reason,
 “ that the counsellors frequently do not alledge the motives on
 “ which they found their opinions. How blindly do the wisest
 “ men follow the advice of the physician, when their health and
 “ life itself is at stake? Why should those alone be ridiculous,
 “ who, in matters of religion, consult that order of men, who
 “ are supposed to have made that the study and business of their
 “ lives; and they, as the learned Bishop of *Meaux* observes, are
 “ not to impose any new article of belief, but only to inform
 “ their flock what was the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles?”
 p. 10, 11. But how if the flock is not satisfied that the Priests
 give this information faithfully? What hinders the flock from
 informing themselves in such a case, by a fair examination and
 comparison between the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles and
 the doctrines of the Priests? To this we have no answer. But

ments,

ments, is nothing more than just and legal punishment for sedition, treason, and rebellion against the state. No wonder that, in the support of these propositions, they should be driven to the necessity of misreporting and misrepresenting facts and characters on both sides, and contradicting each other in blackening on the one hand, and varnishing on the other the men and things which fall in their way.

But, in truth, the best of these writers were but under-workers, employed occasionally to smoothe the road, and to open a more disembarassed and expeditious passage for their capital work, *The Life of REGINALD POLE*, by Father *Philips*, who, in order to magnify his Hero, and his coadjutors in the sacred cause of the church, makes not the least scruple to calumniate every person and every measure that contributed to the Protestant Reformation.

On the other hand, Cardinal *Pole's* virtues being represented as the effect of his religious tenets, the man himself is to be considered as a perfect exemplar of the excellency of the Roman Catholic religion, which must of course be excul-

we must suppose these Priests at least give this information with sincerity, and to the best of their judgment. Whence it will follow, that these Priests of the *Sorbonne*, who are for prosecuting Mr. *Marmontel*, are persuaded that *Intolerance* is a doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and that the doctrine of *Moderation* is a downright *Heresy*.

pated from all those horrid doctrines charged upon it by the Protestants, as there was no trace of any such principles in the life and character of a man, who so well understood, and so strictly practised, whatsoever was prescribed by his religion y.

y There is something extremely remarkable in the circumstances attending the first appearance of this History. “The title-page, we are told, proclaims its publication at *Oxford*; and from this circumstance many an unwary reader hath been led to imagine that it came out *jussu* or *permissu superiorum*.”—But the true account we have of this matter is as follows. “The work, prepared for the press, was in form brought to the Vice-chancellor, and submitted to his inspection; by his order it was perused and examined; it was censured and rejected as a production unfit to receive the sanction of our University-press.—But Mr. *Philips*, seeming resolved that *Oxford* should not be deprived of the intended honour, gains an easy access to another press in the city, where no *imprimatur* or approbation was required: in this manner the work came into the world.” See the Preface to *Papists and Pharisees compared*, by JOHN BURTON, D. D. The Vice-chancellor not having authority over this *other press*, the University are doubtless well justified from any suspicion of giving countenance to this publication. The matter is indeed so left in this apology, as if it still was at Father *Philips*’s option *where* his book should be published. I have been informed, however, upon pretty good authority, that the author would not have gained easy access to any Press in *Oxford*, but thro’ the interest of a Patron since deceased, whose connexions with *Philips* laid him under some groundless imputations of dying in communion with the church of *Rome*. As to the book itself, it hath received answers from several learned pens, which have attacked it with success, but from none with more execution than the compilers of the *Critical Review*, for *June* 1764, and *January* 1765, who close their strictures with the following just remark. “The world has seen many ground-

As the hopes and expectations of the Papists about the time this work was published were not generally known, it was a matter of surprize to the public, whence the Roman Catholics, who for some time past had affected to express their deference for the present government, should derive the assurance to calumniate the Protestant Reformation in so open and profligate a manner. It was not long, however, that we were suffered to remain in this state of suspense. It was published by the Roman Catholics about that time, that encouragement was given them to hope that so considerable a mitigation of the penal laws against them would speedily take place, as would amount to a full toleration ^z.

“ less, impudent Apologies for a church or a state in full possession of power, without the author’s deigning to authenticate the facts ; but this History of Cardinal *Pole* is the most impudent as well as ill-judged insult that ever was offered to the understanding of a people, among whom Papists are now under legal disabilities.”

^z To their boasting of this I can speak with the more certainty, as I had an instance of it myself, in return to a message I had sent to a busy priest stationed in my own parish, and who had said to my face, upon a *former* expostulation, that, “ since the Government thought proper to make no inquiries who frequented their worship, he did not see what business I had with it.” To this I could only reply, “ that I did not wonder a Jesuit should think it *his* business to convert my *heretical* parishioners to Popery, and that it was not *my* business to interfere with him ; but that I apprehended a Protestant Government must have different notions of our respective provinces.” I must own that some things have been incautiously enough

What grounds they had for this presumption is likely enough to remain a secret, as some of those upon whom the accomplishment of these expectations was said to depend, were soon after out of a condition to keep their word with them, if ever they gave it; and, if ever they gave it, it ought to be the daily prayer of every faithful subject of his Majesty, that none of the same spirit and principles may ever be in a condition to make it good.

It is natural, however, for men, even after their disappointments, to hang upon a flattering prospect as long as ever the least glimpse of it remains in

thrown out in the News-papers, as well as in publications of other sorts, as if the assiduity of Popish Emissaries might well pass, without the notice or the concern of the public, upon account of the little success they have had in making converts; and possibly the priest above-mentioned, and others of his class, might conclude from such intimations, that Government would connive at them, whatever lengths they should go. They have by this time, I suppose, found their mistake. His Majesty's Protestant Subjects, I trust, will never consider the article of proselyting their Fellow-Protestants to Popery as a matter of indifference, nor will their Governors in church and state be inattentive to their apprehensions of this sort, when there shall appear sufficient grounds for them, notwithstanding the impatience of the Roman Catholics under such controul; of which they have just now given us a specimen, with as much additional provocation, by abusing and misrepresenting our Protestant Reformation, as can be crowded into a pamphlet of 172 pages, intituled, *An Apology for the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, humbly offered to the Consideration of the KING's Most Excellent Majesty, and both Houses of Parliament*, which is just come to my hands.

light,

fight, and to amuse themselves with hopes, that the obscurity which for the present intercepts it may, at some favourable crisis, once more clear off: and with this persuasion, it was not at all unaccountable that the Papists should still keep on foot the arguments in favour of the toleration they desire, by way of prepossessing the public mind, against the time when the project may be revived with better success. And this doubtless is the motive upon which we have been entertained, of late, with still more of these ingenious essays from Roman Catholic pens.

In the mean time, it becomes us to be upon our guard against every attempt (however speciously coloured) of a vigilant and insidious adversary, whose malignant intentions towards our religion and government will admit of no doubt. It may not therefore be unseasonable to take a cursory view of those pretensions to *Toleration*, which the Papists are now setting up, and which may, not improbably, make impressions upon those who meet with a new argument in favour of a popular error, when and where the refutation of it is not at hand. And as the Papists ground their claim to be tolerated in this country upon *Protestant principles*, it will be necessary to begin with examining into the grounds of the doctrine of *Toleration*, as it is expounded and professed among Protestants, such of them, at least, as adhere to their original principles of Reformation.

The

The plea of our forefathers for separating from the church of *Rome* was, that doctrines, forms of worship, and terms of communion, were imposed upon the members of that church, which were not only not prescribed in the scriptures, but were such as, in many instances, were plainly condemned by the word of God contained in those scriptures.

Upon that occasion the scriptures were declared to be the only authentic Rule of Religion to Christians; and accordingly all the Protestant churches, as soon as they were formed, took care, in their public confessions, to reserve to the written word of God the *exclusive* honour of deciding all controversies, whether concerning points of faith, or circumstances of worship and discipline, that might arise among them.

This common principle set all Protestant churches, with respect to matters merely religious, upon a level. It gave indeed every *man*, as well as every *church*, a right to examine, judge, and determine for himself, what he ought to believe as necessary to salvation, and in what manner to worship God most acceptably to that end. A Protestant church, which had made a general appeal to the scriptures for the truth of religion, in opposition to the pretended authority of the church of *Rome*, could not find fault with any private Protestant who should go to the same scriptures, either for his Creed or his Ritual, even though

though what he should, after examination, espouse of this kind, should differ from the Creed or the Ritual of that particular church. In such a case, compulsive measures to procure his conformity to the majority would be most absurd and inconsistent, and could have no better effect than either to make the man an hypocrite, or expose him to censures and penalties, which no Protestant church had more right to inflict than the church of *Rome*.

And if this was the case where only the liberty of a private Christian came in question, much more absurd and inconsistent would measures of compulsion be, when different churches and societies should be in disagreement with each other upon points of religious controversy. It could indeed hardly be, but that one side must be erroneous, and found their doctrines or their discipline on some mistaken sense of scripture; but still the scriptures were the last resource of *both*; and therefore neither side could, upon the sole consideration of their being, in their own judgement, the more orthodox, proceed to molest or censure the other on account of their dissent, without deserting the original Protestant principle, or indeed without justifying the church of *Rome* for persecuting those who opposed her decisions, even with the plainest evidence of scripture before them.

Thus stood the case with Protestant churches considered as societies merely religious. But as,

in process of time, whole kingdoms and states separated from the church of *Rome*, and adopted the general principles of the first Reformers, and as, in consequence of this separation, it was thought necessary to give the main body of Protestants in every such kingdom or state the face and character of an *established* church, it became farther necessary for that purpose, to take in the civil magistrate as a party, to give a sanction to such ordinances as were intended to regulate the religious discipline of a numerous society, united in one common religious profession.

And here began the question concerning mutual toleration. The establishment of one mode of worship, and of one sett of doctrinal propositions by the sanctions of civil authority, implied the exclusion of all the rest. The excluded sects would of course fall under several civil incapacities; at least, under a deprivation of every privilege appropriated by the civil magistrate to those who conformed to the establishment; and so far as this was the case, the common Protestant principle, namely, that *the scriptures are the final resort in all questions concerning religion*, would seem to be deserted. It did not satisfy Dissenters to say, that, the settlement of doctrinal points being first left to churchmen and divines, the civil magistrate no farther interfered than to give his solemn approbation of them, and for the rest undertook only to regulate external forms, and things indifferent

ferent in themselves, for the sake of order and decency. The dissenters from the establishment constantly remonstrated, that churchmen or divines, as such, had no more right to settle points of doctrine for all the people, than the civil magistrate; that *settling points of doctrine* was only another phrase for *interpreting the scriptures*, and that to take from the people the right of interpreting the scriptures for themselves, amounted in effect to the taking from them the use of the scriptures.

With respect to the modes of worship, and external ceremonies, the question was, not, what the civil magistrate in his judicial or legislative capacity thought of their indifference, or of their conducing to order and decency; but what the dissenter thought of them when examined by the scriptural rules of discipline and edification. If, in the judgment of the dissenter, the established forms or modes of worship, or discipline, were inconsistent with those rules laid down in the scriptures, it was not the approbation of the civil magistrate that could authorize the dissenter's compliance with them. Private conscience in such cases becomes a party, the judgment on which God hath reserved for his own tribunal.

History informs us, that in the progress, and indeed in the beginning of the Reformation in some countries, these considerations were too frequently over-ruled, and the authority of the civil
magistrate

magistrate improperly, not to say unwarrantably, interposed. In which impropriety they were too often abetted and justified by Protestant Divines, even so far as to give countenance to many detestable acts of persecution, which stand recorded in authentic history, to their great reproach. Every man of plain sense might see that these divines could not be justified in their own separation from the *Roman* church, but on account of hardships and impositions of the very same sort with those they now obtruded on their Protestant-brethren. And, to speak impartially, the miserable quibbles which have been employed by different Protestant communions to distinguish one of these cases from the other, have done nothing more for the *men*, than to leave suspicions upon their sincerity; or for their *cause*, than to shew what plausible colours may be put upon the *very worst*, by ingenious and interested advocates.

In these latter times, the doctrine of religious liberty has been more generally understood and more kindly entertained than heretofore; and though it cannot be denied that there are still remaining, in some Protestant communities, many unwarrantable restraints and incumbrances upon Protestant dissenters from the established system, yet it must be acknowledged, that the original Protestant principle of mutual toleration hath recovered its credit, particularly in our own country, to a greater degree than could have been expected.

expected. And though this principle hath not yet operated to the full and effectual relief of all those conscientious dissenters who are intitled to it; yet it must be allowed, that the liberty they now enjoy of professing and practising their respective opinions and discipline, is such as they who contrived the bulwarks of ecclesiastical establishment in Protestant states, vehemently condemned, and, had they lived in these times, would have opposed with all their power and interest.

The notion that misled our forefathers in this matter was, that, if more than one form of religion should be tolerated in a country where only one form of civil government was established, some disorder and confusion would ensue, pernicious to the peace and welfare of civil society; and no wonder, where the civil magistrate was so persuaded, that such an apprehension should make deep impressions upon him.

Churchmen indeed went upon other principles. Taking the word, CHURCH, in a certain sense, they concluded, it must have authority to judge and censure erroneous opinions, under the name of *Heresy*; differing herein from the popish doctrine on this head, in nothing but in their account of the constitution of the church to which they ascribed this authority, and such limitation of her powers, as excluded *infallibility*, rather perhaps in words and declarations, than in reality. On another hand, they imagined that schism, with respect

respect to matters of discipline, was so precise and obvious an idea, that they made no scruple to class it at the head of those immoral offences which were understood to be the proper objects of ecclesiastical correction.

With these reasons, alledged by the ecclesiastical powers for reserving to themselves the punishment of heresy and schism, the civil magistrate had little to do, so long as civil society did not suffer by these supposed offences. But being persuaded, by artful and ambitious ecclesiastics, that heresy and schism were crimes which struck at the foundations of civil government, as well as at the peace and prosperity of the church, and having no experience of the benefits arising to the state from the free toleration of opinions and modes of worship which had no civil influence upon the commerce of civil society, the civil magistrate interposed, and gave his sanction to the claims of church authority to inflict penalties and censures on heretics and schismatics; and had heresy and schism been the dangerous frightful things to civil government they were represented to be, he would have rightly interposed. But this was not the case, nor indeed could it be *a priori* that it ever would be the case, till some overt acts of heresy or schism had disturbed the civil peace and order of the community under his protection, which however he would have no reason to fear, while no religious society pretended

tended to more than the full and free exercise of their Christian Liberty in matters of faith and worship.

But then, on the other hand, whenever, under the pretence of conscience and religion, men, whether dissenters from the establishment or not, professed such principles and avowed them by their practices, as manifestly broke in upon the peace and due regulations of civil society, the magistrate would then interpose his authority with the highest propriety. The same scriptures which reserve to the Christian his right of private judgment in matters purely religious, reserve likewise to the civil magistrate his right of punishing evil-doers. The same scriptures which take the conscientious Christian out of the hands of earthly judgment, with respect to his religious opinions and principles, by leaving him to stand or fall to his heavenly master alone; deliver him over to the civil justice of his country, the moment he takes occasion from his principles to break in upon the peace and righteousness of civil intercourse. The same scriptures indeed make it the *duty* of the magistrate to see that his subjects lead quiet and peaceable lives in *all honesty*, as well as in all godliness, and therefore can never be understood to countenance or abet the disturbers of public peace, or the transgressors of the known rules of righteousness, upon any pretended plea of conscience. The Christian religion dis-

claims the province of regulating civil society, farther than that, by instilling good principles, and reforming the manners of individuals, it provides in the most effectual manner for the peace and welfare of societies made up of Christian governors, and Christian subjects; and for the rest, confines itself to its proper office of conducting men to a kingdom which is not of this world.

These several cases might be illustrated by a variety of examples from different Histories. But there is one which seems to me more particularly apposite to the present purpose, as it refers to principles which were pretended to be derived from those of the Protestant Reformation. What I mean, is the case of the Anabaptists in Germany.

The principal and distinguishing tenet of this sect was, *The Invalidity of Infant-baptism*, and the necessity there was that their followers should be re-baptized, when they came to maturity, in order to make them qualified subjects of the kingdom of Christ. In support of this doctrine they alledged, the silence of the Scriptures with respect to Infant-baptism, and the incapacity of infants for making the necessary stipulations required on that solemn occasion. And upon these questions the controversy is kept on foot to this very time.

Had

Had this denomination of dissenters conducted themselves as peaceable subjects of the state, and conformed themselves to the laws of that particular government under which they lived, and were protected in the enjoyment of their civil privileges, they would have been, upon the principles of the Reformation, as much intitled to toleration in professing their peculiar doctrine, and practising the ordinances they grounded upon it, as any other Protestants whatsoever.

It is of very little consequence to the civil magistrate whether a good subject has been baptized once or twice, or whether in his infancy, or when he came of age. This is a point which affects none but the man himself in his religious capacity. And even whole societies might, upon this question, separate in public worship from other religious societies in the same civil community, without being wanting in any one duty incumbent on good citizens.

But when they, who first distinguished themselves by this religious opinion, proceeded to graft upon it doctrines which were immediately destructive of all civil authority, and began not only to oppose the magistrate, but to possess themselves of his power by violence, and to appropriate all earthly dominion to themselves, as the elect of God, and to pretend to derive their possession of it from him by immediate revelation; and under this pretence, to commit murders and other out-

rages upon their fellow-subjects ; — when, I say, the matter came to these extremities, the principles of toleration were out of the question. No man's conscience, directed by the word of God, could lead him to these brutal and immoral acts ; and the rulers of those particular states to whom these desperate enthusiasts gave this offence, were well justified in their inflicting severe punishment upon such of their ring-leaders, as were the authors and instigators of these unjustifiable acts of rebellion and public mischief ^a.

^a Vide *Sleidan*. Comment. lib. X. sub initio et alibi. *Bayle's* Dictionary, Art. ANABAPTISTS, and many others. It is not indeed to be denied that some Religionists of this denomination were inhibited and severely treated by the civil powers, in some other places, particularly in *Switzerland*, when their tenets were at least of a more peaceable sort. The excuse for this was, that their doctrines were still such as in fact affected the security of the state. See *Bayle*, u. l. *Remark* [L], where it appears that this apology was more plausible in some states than it was in others ; and they who treated them as a people not to be tolerated, must be condemned or justified by the nature and circumstances of those particular cases, which came under their cognizance. See a fine passage of *Erasmus* concerning the absurdity and iniquity of Protestants punishing certain Anabaptists, in his *Life* by *Dr. Fortin*, vol. II. p. 276, and the just remark of the excellent Biographer upon it. Be this as it may, it is certain that they who now are, and for above a century backwards have been, distinguished by the name of *Anabaptists*, have intitled themselves to *equal toleration*, not only by disavowing the seditious doctrines of those men who, under that denomination, fell into those abominable extravagancies at *Munster* and elsewhere, but by professing others,

Let

Let us now turn to the Roman Catholics who live under our Protestant government and confriendly, in the highest degree, to the peace and welfare of civil society. I mention this the rather, as one of our Popish Champions in the *Public Ledger* will needs have the case of the *Papists*, to be the same with that of the *Baptists*, alledging, that the latter had no more condemned the rebellious principles of their forefathers than the former. Now, not to mention the variety of sects into which the Anabaptists have been divided, and in what respects they have differed each from the others; it is well known, that the most considerable body of them in the *Low Countries* coalesced under the name of *Mennonites*, who formally disowned the errors of particular sectaries of that denomination in their public Confessions. Even *George Cassander*, a Popish writer, bore an honourable testimony in favour of the *Mennonites*, namely, that “they had always most
“vehemently renounced the madness of the *Munster* and *Bat-*
“*tenburgh* enthusiasts, who meditated a restoration of Christ’s
“kingdom, which, as they said, consisted in the destruction of
“the wicked by external force.” *Bayle*, u. f. Rem. [G]. But to give the objector the fairest opportunity of judging how the case stands between the *Mennonites* or *Baptist* and his clients, I shall take the liberty to transcribe a curious passage from the article above-cited in Mr. *Bayle*’s Dictionary, to which every reader, who may be edified or entertained by so fine an anecdote, may not have access. “Mr. *De Turenne*” (who, by the way, had turned from the Protestant to the Popish communion) “being one day in a coach with Mr. *Van Beuning*, expressed his dislike to him at the toleration which the *States General* granted to all sorts of religions. What Mr. *Van Beuning* answered on behalf of the *Mennonites* was as follows :
“Why are you averse to the toleration of this sect? They
“are very honest people, and the most easy in the world;
“they never aspire to employments; they thwart no man’s
“ambition; they traverse no man’s views by competition or

der how far their conduct and principles intitle them to the toleration for which they plead.

“ intrigues. It were to be wished, that in every country half
 “ the people would make a conscience of aiming at dignities ;
 “ the other half would arrive at them with less difficulty, and
 “ without employing so many mean arts and unlawful methods.
 “ We have no reason to apprehend the rebellion of a sect, one
 “ of whose articles of faith is, that it is unlawful to bear arms.
 “ How great a security is it to a sovereign to know that his
 “ subjects are restrained by such a bridle, whatever imposts or
 “ tallage is laid upon them ? The *Mennonites* contribute their
 “ share to the charges of the government. This is sufficient.
 “ With this we levy troops, which are more useful to us than
 “ these people would be, were they to enlist themselves. They
 “ edify us by the simplicity of their manners ; they apply
 “ themselves to arts and business, without squandering away
 “ their own patrimony, or the wealth they acquire, in luxury
 “ and vice. Other communions behave differently. Voluptu-
 “ ousness and the expences of vanity, are, in them, a con-
 “ stant source of scandal, and a weakening of the state. *But*
 “ *they refuse to swear.* A mighty matter indeed ! The autho-
 “ rity of the tribunals receive no prejudice thereby. These
 “ people think themselves as much obliged by an *affirmation*
 “ of the truth, as they could be by an oath. All the use of
 “ administering an oath consists in this, that the person who
 “ violates it is in fear of being more severely punished by God,
 “ and exposes himself to infamy, and even corporal punishment
 “ from men. The *Mennonites* fear the same consequences if
 “ they violate their Affirmation ; they are therefore bound by
 “ the same obligation with other men.” Will any man pretend
 to give the like amiable character of Papists in any Protestant
 country wherever they reside ? I know it hath been said, that
 the Papists in *Holland* have always demeaned themselves as
 peaceable and even dutiful subjects to the government of the
 States General, and with the same affections to the common
 If

If the only objections we have to Papists were that they hold *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*,

cause of the country, as other dissenters from the established religion; and this has been made an argument for granting them as full and free a toleration in *Great Britain* as they enjoy in the *United Provinces*. This, however, hath not always been the case, as appears by the following particulars. In the year 1646, Cardinal *Mazarin* formed a project of giving up *Catalonia* (then in the hands of the *French*) to the *Spaniards*, in exchange for the *Low Countries*, and the county of *Burgundy*. But as this exchange would have thrown advantages into the hands of *France*, which could not fail to give umbrage to those who were the nearest neighbours to these countries, particularly *England* and the *United Provinces*, it was quite necessary for the Cardinal to obviate such objections as might arise from the consideration of the weight this exchange would have thrown into the scale of *France*. The advantage of this exchange to the *United Provinces*, he pretended, would be, that, “they would no longer have occasion to be at the excessive expence of keeping up a barrier on the frontier of the *Spanish Netherlands*, as *France* would form no pretensions to their country, as the *Spaniards*, from whom they had formerly revolted, would always do; on another hand he pleads, that the *United Provinces* might then place more confidence in the *Catholics* among them, to the mutual advantage of both parties, the *Catholics* in those Provinces being persecuted, not so much through the hatred born to their religion, as from being *Partisans and Adherents to the Spaniards*.” *Le Clerc, Bibl. Choisie*, tom. XX. p. 34, 35. So then we see the *States General* have not always thought it good policy to tolerate the *Papists* in the same degree as they did other sects. In the mean time it is a noble testimony born by a *Popish Cardinal* to the religious moderation of the *Protestant states*, namely, that they did not subject the *Catholics* to penalties on account of their religion, but *pour être tenus (et cela avec raison)*

Saint-worship, the proper Sacrifice of Christ in the Mass, or some other doctrines merely religious, wherein the Papists differ from Protestants, the former would be intitled to toleration, on the same footing with other dissenters from the established church. These doctrines, abstracted from the authority on which the Roman Catholics support and inforce them, might be professed and practised, by persons who might still be good subjects to the state. They might pretend scriptural authority for these doctrines, strange and absurd as they are, and adhere to them on that pretence only. As matters of private opinion, or, if you will, of conscience, they would be no more obnoxious to the magistrate than other

affectionnés et adhérens au parti d'Espagne. That is, in plain terms, for being *Rebels* to the state. "But," saith *Le Clerc*, "did not this able politician see, that these Catholics, in case of the exchange, would have become suspected of favouring *France*, and that the States would have looked upon them with so much the more aversion, as the fear of *France* would have been greater than the States had then of *Spain*?" The pretensions of *Spain* and the House of *Austria* to the United Provinces hath long since ceased. Since when, the only Catholic power they have had to fear, is *France*. How the *Dutch* Papists have behaved since this alteration took place, I pretend not to know. But, if what *Sir William Temple* said of them, when he wrote his *Observations* on the *United Provinces*, namely, that "they have neither given any disturbance to the government, nor expressed any inclinations to a change, or to any foreign power," continue still to be true of them, they have certainly a title to toleration, which the Papists of *Great Britain* as certainly have not.

harmless

harmless peculiarities which distinguish one sect from another.

But when we find that the Papists ground these doctrines on the infallibility of the Pope or the church of *Rome*, and pronounce all to be Heretics who dissent from that church, — that they consider such Heretics as *de jure* excluded from all civil and social as well as religious privileges, — that Catholics are not obliged to keep faith with them, more particularly where their covenants with Heretics interfere with the interests of their church^b, — that any cruelties or executions in-

^b See Pope *Clement XI's* Letter to the King of *Spain*, in the *Appendix*, N^o II, which is decisive as to this point, and shews the consummate assurance of those late Popish Advocates who have denied this to be a tenet of the *Roman* church. For the present, I shall only consider it as a proof of Popish *Intolerance*, which, taken along with their annual Anathemas denounced upon Heretics; their Indexes of prohibited books (one of which was published by *Benedict XIV*, no longer ago than the year 1758), and what has been attempted in *France* against Mr. *Marmontel* by the doctors of the *Sorbonne*, amounts to a demonstration, that *Intolerance* is the avowed principle of the *Roman* church in all countries, and under all governments. It hath been said, and seems at present to be taken for granted, that Protestant states cannot, consistently with Protestant principles, exclude Papists from the benefit of *Toleration*, at least on the score of their religious principles and profession. Perhaps we shall not be allowed to call *Intolerance* a religious doctrine, as there is in it so deep a tincture of politics, and likewise as it must owe so much of its support to the secular arm; the doctrines, however, upon which it is founded being manifestly such, I shall beg leave to take that

flicted upon Heretics convict, are sufficiently authorised by a commission from the Pope or the

point for granted, and proceed to consider, how far upon Protestant principles, the Papists (adhering still to these doctrines) have a right to be tolerated in Protestant communities. The Protestant principle of free, equal, and mutual Toleration may be considered under the notion of a covenant, wherein the tolerating churches, as contracting parties, agree to acknowledge each other's freedom and independency, and mutually to support each other under the common protection of, and in subordination to the civil magistrate, in the full and absolute enjoyment of their religious liberty. But a Popish *intolerant* church can plead no right to be included in such a covenant, upon any principles of equity whatsoever. And if the scriptures prescribe to Protestants the Toleration of an intolerant church, it must be in some passages which equally conclude against Christians defending themselves against their most inveterate and determined enemies. For the destruction of Protestants is confessedly the aim and end of Popish Intolerance. This being premised, let us now consider upon what grounds the plea for the Toleration of Popery in this country proceeds. "We do not consider," says an ingenious and able writer, "that in suppressing a place of public worship, we are doing what we certainly know to be unlawful, for the sake of preventing what we only suspect to be dangerous." A little before, this Apologist had called Popery *a diabolical superstition*. A *diabolical superstition* may prescribe and practise *the worship of the Devil*. Now I cannot but apprehend that many an honest *Christian* Magistrate may not *certainly* know, that it is not lawful for him to suppress a place where THE DEVIL IS PUBLICLY WORSHIPED. It may be said, that this is a case not to be supposed with respect to the Papists. God forbid it should, but it is nevertheless a case which comes within our Advocate's plea. For he says, "The suppressing a place of church

church of *Rome*, — and that every Papist is bound on the peril of damnation, to a strict obedience,

“ public worship by authority, is committing an act of *violence*, and breaking in upon the natural and unalienable right which every man possesses, of worshipping *WHAT* and *HOW* he *pleases*.” And consequently of worshipping the *Devil*, if so he *pleases*, and, if so he *pleases*, with human sacrifices. The reader will be pleased to observe, that this natural unalienable right is, according to our Advocate, *unlimited*: He hath put no restriction upon it; nor indeed could he, without bringing the Papist, in his present situation in this country, within it. He is well aware of this, and therefore thinks fit to represent, “ That suppressing Popish worship is in order to prevent their assembling together for the purpose of propagating their pernicious *political* principles.” What! in their places of public worship? — Hardly. They are wiser, and have *other* places for those *laudable* purposes. And, I presume, the Magistrate too is wiser than to give so silly a reason for his interfering. The Magistrate finds himself *directed by law* to suppress places of Popish public worship; and if you want any farther account of his proceedings, you must go to the *reason* of the Law which prohibits the public worship of Papists in *Great Britain*. And here you will find that the Legislators were so much of Philosophers, at least, as to discern that no man could have either a *natural* or an *unalienable* right to worship *what* and *how* and *where* he pleased, whose principle is to exterminate every sect but his own; because that man’s religion would prevent his entering into any binding pacts, whether civil or religious, with those who did not worship *what* and *how* this intolerant worshiper pleased. Our Advocate then should have set out with proving that *Intolerance* is *not* a principle of the Roman Catholic religion; and this indeed he seems to insinuate by calling for overt-acts in each individual for a proof of it. One would think it sufficient to prove this, to appeal to the solemn
and

and an implicit submission, to the dictates of the Pope and his church: — When these doctrines, I

decisions of that society to which such individuals belong, to cite their avowed doctrines, and to shew that whenever they had the power in their hands, they have uniformly practised according to these doctrines. Indeed we need go no farther for our proof of this than our Advocate himself, who informs us that “The principles of pure Popery are calculated by *Satan* their author to make this world an Hell, and mankind Dæmons before their time.” One would imagine that every act of joint-worship with such a society, but particularly every act of religious submission to the teachers of such a society, would be an overt-act sufficient to determine the principles and intentions of every person who adheres to this society. To obviate this, the Gentleman will have it, that the Popish laity may be peaceably disposed, though their priests are not; and asks, “What avails the zeal of the priests, without the people to follow them?” It were to be wished that our Protestant advocates for the toleration of Popery would suffer the Papists to plead their own cause, at least till they are a little better acquainted with the Popish arguments for it. For what say the Papists to this supposition? Why, they make the implicit subjection of the laity to their priests an argument that the same laity would be implicitly subject to any form of civil government. Which of these suppositions shall we abide by? To suppose the layman would not follow the priest, is destroying Mr. *Brook's* argument for tolerating the Papists; an argument which has the sanction of the popish author of the *Considerations on the Penal Laws*, &c. To admit that the layman would implicitly follow his priest, is to make the question of our Protestant Advocate beside the purpose, as being founded on a false supposition. Of the same sort is the intimation, that the Papists are *as little* influenced by their principles as the rest of mankind; whereas the whole force of the plea for their Toleration, made use of by the Popish writers

say,

say, are added to their other tenets, it is evident that no Protestant prince or state can be safe from

above-mentioned, depends upon the supposition that they are *more* so. "Christianity," says this Gentleman, "does not any where, as I remember, authorise *double taxes* on account of wrong *opinions*, religious or political, nor ever draws its arguments from the fear of the Constable." Why no, neither does Christianity authorise the Window-Tax, or the duty upon Foreign Imports. But neither does it disallow them, as legal measures of supporting civil government. And if *single taxes* are lawful in some cases for the ordinary support of civil government, without any prohibition from Christianity, *double taxes* are equally lawful in other cases, where the safety and peace of the civil government equally require them. This then carries us back to the reason of imposing these *double taxes*; and then the only proper questions will be, whether such taxes are imposed on *religious* or *political* considerations? Whether the persons on whom they are imposed are friends or enemies to the civil government which imposes them? Whether, upon proper evidence that they are enemies, Christianity forbids the civil government to restrain their influence by such means as double taxes? Questions which our Advocate chuses to keep out of sight, and artfully enough throws in the term *political opinions*, as if equally unrestrained by Christianity as *opinions* merely *religious*; and as if the object of double taxes were merely *political speculations*, as harmless and inoffensive to the Protestant government of *Great Britain* as *opinions* merely *religious*! The mention of the *Constable* goes upon another inadmissible supposition, namely, that he is used as an instrument to convert the Papists from their religious errors; a misrepresentation which may afford the Gentleman occasion to be facetious, but will surely do no credit to his candor as a reasoner. He seems to think, that it makes a great deal for his cause, that "Christ never applied to a Justice of the Peace for a warrant to
the

the destructive practices of Papists a moment longer than they are the weaker party ; not to mention numberless mischiefs in a Protestant community, which must arise from an intercourse with people thus principled, even while they *are* the weaker party ^c.

“ shut up an Heathen chapel, or to apprehend and imprison a
 “ Priest. Yet Christ and his Apostles,” says he, “ not only
 “ *suspectea*, but knew that their enemies sought their blood and
 “ would have it ; and they knew the individuals, whose *practice*,
 “ not their *speculative principles* merely, were dangerous and
 “ destructive.” Very well ! what is now the conclusion ?
 Why, this or nothing ; “ That this precedent contains a pro-
 “ hibition to the Christian Magistrate to take *any* measures to re-
 “ strain the power of an enemy, whose practices he certainly
 “ knows would, without such restraint, subvert the *civil* as
 “ well as the *religious* constitution of the country over which he
 “ presides.” Is this the doctrine of Christianity ? If it is, I am
 sure that one of our Advocate’s positions is *antichristian*, namely,
 that, “ *England* ought to make no peace with *France*.” For the
 Gospel precedent he brings will reach the one case equally with
 the other, and equally oblige the *British* government not only
 to be at perpetual peace with *France*, but to purchase that
 peace upon whatever conditions *France* shall please to prescribe.
 There are other objections to this gentleman’s theory, which I
 forbear to mention. I doubt not but he means well ; and
 mistakes which proceed from an excess of moderation and cha-
 rity (which, I dare vouch, is the case of these of our Advocate)
 are, of all others, the most excusable, to say nothing of the very
 many valuable things to be met with in this ingenious writer’s
 lucubrations on other subjects. See *Crito*, vol. II.

^c The effects of Popish Bigotry among our common people is
 an evil of very pernicious tendency, and by no means sufficiently

On these weighty and urgent considerations were the penal laws against the Papists first attended to, because perhaps not generally understood. Some of the Roman Catholics affect, in promiscuous company, to laugh at the influence the Protestants suppose their Priests have upon them, and to treat this as a mere chimæra. There are doubtless profligates and libertines, who pay no regard to religion, among the Papists as well as among the Protestants. I speak not of these, but of others, who will join with the gayest company in all the fashionable dissipations of the times, even to the very borders of libertinism, for which the Protestant religion affords no atonement but a serious and effectual repentance and total conversion ; and yet, in the midst of all this, are as diligent and punctual in their attendance upon the minutest formalities, such as going to *Confession*, keeping *Fasts* and *Festivals*, repeating their *Devotions*, &c. as the most superstitious Papist in the kingdom ; and, what is more, as zealous and assiduous in making converts (where that can be managed without observation) as the Priests themselves. The Roman Catholics are taught, and are ready to teach others, that whatever liberties they take of this kind are atoned for by having recourse to the *peace of the Church*, and that all offences are blotted out by absolution, which they know well enough cannot be had without paying due deference to the pretended dispensers of it. Bigotry among Papists of the lower ranks is more open, and without disguise. Their zeal, unqualified with the artifices of a polite education, will not permit them to conceal the implicit faith they have in their Priests, or to baulk themselves in delivering the plain doctrines they learn from them (even the most absurd in religion, and sometimes the most treasonable in politics), when in dispute with Protestants. What effect the open avowal of such principles must have upon the lower classes of Protestants, many of whom have neither been properly instructed, nor are of suf-
acted,

acted, and afterwards revived and enlarged, not upon mere presumption that people who hold

sufficient capacity to cope with the subtlety and assurance of a Popish Priest, may easily be conjectured. They who become proselytes to Popery learn disaffection to Protestant Government and the Protestant Religion by the same sett of maxims ; and even, it is to be feared, to undervalue the most solemn bonds of civil society, when the interests of the church come in competition with them. Many are the instances of this kind that might be brought, of the pernicious influence of Popish Bigotry upon our common people at this very period. It hath been often observed how remarkably useful the zeal and spirit of their female devotees have been to the Popish Priests in their grand business of proselyting. At the beginning of the Reformation, the desertion of so many monks afforded matter of much pleasure to the Popish writers, upon the supposition that the chief motive of their conversion was the liberty of entering into the married state ; and I remember that among other invidious reasons given by the Jesuits for the conversion of the late Mr. Bower, one was, that *he was tired of lying alone*. It seems, however, that the Papists, now that it will serve their own turn, have no objection to this matrimonial expedient of making converts. An honest plain countryman might be too phlegmatic to be wrought upon by an ingenious quibble, or too penetrating to be ensnared by a piece of jesuitical reasoning, who perhaps could not resist the temptation of a wife with a decent fortune, provided by his converters. Marriage has lately been the never-failing bait to many Protestants, both men and women, to give up the religion of their Bibles, for the idolatrous worship of the *Man of Sin*. In most cases the conversion has been made a previous condition. But where the Protestant man or woman have been backward, the good work hath been left to be perfected by the Catholic husband or wife, who have seldom failed to accomplish it by methods suggested to them by the directors of their consciences. Sometimes indeed all expedients have
such

such principles might probably be seditious or rebellious in future times, when favourable occa-

failed, and the Protestant mate hath held fast his or her integrity in spite of all the cajolings or the menaces employed to seduce them. This firmness, however, hath brought upon such, particularly the poor women, a variety of ill usage, which, in one late instance I am about to transcribe from *The Gentleman's Magazine* for April 1766, ended fatally. “ On Saturday the 5th “ of April 1766, William Whittle, condemned at Lancaster “ assizes for the murder of his wife and two children, was ex- “ ecuted on Lancaster-Moor, and his body hung in chains. He “ was a ROMAN CATHOLIC, and confessed the fact. He was “ asked the motive for committing so horrid a crime? He said, “ his Priest told him, he should be damned for marrying an “ Heretic.—Why murder two innocent children? His answer “ was, the mother had carried them to church, so they would “ have been damned, if he had not killed them; but now, he “ said, they were in Purgatory, and would go to heaven in due “ time. On this fellow's being hung up, the Rev. Mr. Oliver, “ the clergyman who attended him” [this is a mistake, the Rev. Mr. Oliver of Preston was the Magistrate who committed him to prison; the clergyman who attended him was the Rev. Mr. Leigh, curate of Lancaster, whose good offices however Whittle rejected, calling out for a Priest of his own sort], “ received the following letter: Sir, I make bold to acquaint “ you, that your house, and every clergyman's that is in the “ town” [of Preston, near which the shocking fact was committed, and the criminal gibbeted], “ or any black son of a “ b—h like you, for you are nothing but Heretics and damned “ souls. If William Whittle, that worthy man, hangs up ten “ days, you may fully expect to be blown to damnation. I “ have nothing more material, but I desire you will make in- “ terest for him to be cut down, or else you may fully expect “ it at ten days end. My name is S. M. and W. G.” See the *St. James's Chronicle*, April 15, 1766. Whittle, before this letter was made public, was spoken of as a stupid, bigoted,

sions offered ; but upon the evidence of facts, and the repeated experience of their perpetual plots

ignorant fellow, from whose behaviour no consequences could be drawn to the disadvantage of Popery. For his bigotry, however, he himself accounted very satisfactorily, and from that account it appears, what laudable use the clergy of the church of *Rome* (who would not be thought either stupid or ignorant) occasionally make of the stupidity and ignorance of those who come under their direction. On the other hand, some of his own fraternity esteemed him a *worthy man*, whose sufferings were meritorious, and who was neither so stupid nor so ignorant as not to know, that the destruction of three Heretics, at the price of one Catholic Martyr, was no bad bargain. I am far from believing that *Whittle's* Priest spoke the sense of every Roman Catholic Priest in the kingdom ; though, from instances of cruelty in a lower degree inflicted upon Protestant wives by Popish husbands, which have occurred, and some within my own knowledge, one would be apt to suspect that such methods of conversion are but too generally encouraged by them : particularly if what a Popish Advocate in the *Gazetteer* said of them, some time in *October* last, is true, *viz.* “ that a Romish
“ Priest in a Protestant country, may prosecute his interested and
“ ambitious views, at the expence of his religion, when he
“ thinks fit.” I am likewise persuaded that there are many Lay-Papists in the kingdom who abhor this fact of *Whittle* as much as any Protestant can do. But if their religion does not give countenance to such doctrines as this alledged by this miserable man, why do they not by some public Act disavow their approbation of them ? why do they leave suspicions upon themselves and their religion by their silence, when such occasions call upon them so pressingly to explain themselves, and particularly when they are complaining of the severity of the Penal Laws, for which surely there is no room, if such are the principles of Papists in general ? Here the aforesaid *Advocate* steps in, and tells us, “ that the Papists have no presses at com-
“ mand, and are obliged to send abroad even for their books of
and

and machinations against the government, from the first moment that the *British* throne was filled by a Protestant Prince.

“devotion.” The contrary of which is notoriously known, even from so many of their libels, some of them mentioned above, namely, *The Life of Cardinal Pole*, *Considerations on the Penal Laws*, *The True-born Englishman*, &c. &c. About a century and a half ago, Protestants made a conscience of intermarrying with Papists, and very few were, in those days, so unequally yoked. But King *Charles* I having set the example, these scruples have vanished away, and, as my author hath it, “since that example, the *devout* and *holy* women of the Popish communion have been its most useful advocates and supports. They have been and are *eminently so* in our days.” He proceeds to shew by what means; and concludes with an account of *one* faculty or privilege, among several others, granted by his superiors to one *John Laker*, an *English* priest, about the year 1680, which, the said author observes, “must have been of great and comfortable importance in fixing the adherence of the Ladies, &c.” See a pamphlet, published in 1748, intituled, *An Enquiry into the Behaviour of our great Churchmen since the Reformation in the enacting and executing of Penal Laws against Papists and Protestant Dissenters*, pages 36, 37, 38. It hath been often wished that the Legislature would take this affair of Protestants intermarrying with Papists into serious consideration. That the Papists gain great advantages over the Protestants by these intermarriages, in point of conversions, is notorious. By what means, is set forth in the pamphlet above referred to; the chief of which perhaps is a sort of influence thrown into the hands of Popish Priests too indelicate to be mentioned here, and too indecent to be employed by a Protestant Minister, who is to conduct himself according to the *Purity* as well as the *Truth* of the Christian Religion. If the Protestant settlement of the Crown is of any consequence to the happiness of *Great Britain*, the methods taken by its internal enemies to undermine it, even in

Pope *Pius Vth* began with Queen *Elizabeth* in 1569, whom he excommunicated, and, as far as in him lay, deprived of the allegiance of her subjects, by absolving them from the obligation of their oaths, and anathematizing such as continued in their obedience to her government. By which she was left to the mercy of the first ruffian who could find the means to execute the vengeance of his Holiness in a more effectual manner than would be done by merely fixing the rescript to the gate of the Vatican. The Bull is preserved by Bishop *Burnet*, and, by the tenor of it, it appears, that as Queen *Elizabeth's* Protestant successors have offended the Holy See in the same articles, they must of course be liable to the same sentence^d. How far the

the minutest instances, ought not to be matters of indifference to the Guardians of the public welfare. The article now under consideration would not misbecome the particular attention of our worthy pastors upon the episcopal bench. They may easily be in possession of very interesting matters of fact relating to these intermarriages; and if there is nothing in the legal course of ecclesiastical discipline that may prevent the pernicious consequences of such alliances to the state, they may have audience, where their wisdom and dignity will effectually give weight to their remonstrances, and sufficiently recommend such remedies for this growing evil, as might put a seasonable stop to it. The same may be said of the pernicious influence of Popish Bigotry upon the Protestant vulgar, in other instances of civil intercourse.

^d See Hist. Reform. vol. II. Collection of Records, part II. book iii. N^o 13. the last in the volume. *Sixtus* the Vth published another Bull in 1587, by which he gave away Queen principles

principles on which this Bull was founded operated upon the Papists of those days, the religious designation of the *Spanish Armada*, and the frequent Plots and Conspiracies of the good Catholics of that reign, are indisputable evidence.

The next four princes were of the *Stuart*-family, but sprung, by the mother's side, from the stock of the *leagu*ing Dukes of *Guise*, the bitterest and most unrelenting persecutors of the Protestants that history has recorded. The two first of them indeed were educated in the Protestant religion, but not without an early bias in favour of Popery, which grew upon them, in proportion as they came to observe that the principles of that religion were most favourable to the exercise of arbitrary power, and were accordingly, on many occasions, avowed by them, and were indeed the rather applicable to those occasions, as they esteemed large bodies of their Protestant subjects to be little less *Heretics* for dissenting from *their* church than the Papists esteemed all other Protestants to be for separating from the church of *Rome*. Other occasions and exigences, how-

Elizabeth's kingdoms to the first that should seize them. "This," says *Rapin*, was the King of *Spain*, who was ready to make "an advantage of the Pope's kind offer." This *kind offer* was indeed implied in *Pius's* Bull, though not so expressly mentioned. But the kingdom being taken from *Elizabeth*, must be given to somebody, and *Mary* Queen of *Scots* was just as ready to accept of it as *Philip* was afterwards.

ever, arising, and the temper of their parliaments and people being totally averse to the Papists, as the determined enemies of the civil constitution, and infamous corrupters of religion, the first of these Princes was given to understand, that “ he
 “ could not tolerate Popery without a Parliament,
 “ unless he would let his subjects see, that he took
 “ unto himself the liberty to throw down the
 “ laws of the land at his pleasure^e.” *Charles*, his successor, ventured to let his subjects see this at all hazards, but with very ill success. In the mean time, the Papists, according to custom, considered the favourable disposition of these Princes with very little gratitude. It was sufficient that their schemes were disappointed; and supposing that a change of government would re-establish their religion, they pursued that grand point through both these reigns by the most wicked plots and practices, without the least regard either to the reputation or safety of these deluded Princes, who ventured so much in shewing their friendly disposition towards them^f.

^e See Archbishop *Abbot's* Letter to *James I*, in *Rushworth*, vol. I. p. 85.

^f *James* came to *England* from professing a Religion and governing a People the most contrary and averse to Popery. With these he was obliged to *chime in*, while he was among them, even so far as to express his contempt for the church of *England* for retaining some ceremonies which passed in *Scotland* for remnants of Popish superstition. The Papists were not aware of his versatile disposition, and how easily he might be wrought

The

The two latter, namely *Charles II* and *James II*, were Papists themselves, the former secretly, the latter openly.

Charles loved his ease and pleasures too well, to embroil himself with his people so far as the Popish party would have engaged him; who were so disgusted with his indolence, and so impatient to accomplish their favourite project of root-

upon by proper instruments to make matters easy to them, and therefore determined to make sure work at the beginning of his reign, by the Gun-powder Conspiracy. These were the sentiments of such of them at least as pushed on the Plot in concurrence with the court of *Rome*, whatever intimations the more moderate Papists at home might have of his inclination to serve their cause. See *Casaubon's* Epistle to *Fronto Ducaeus*, N^o 624. edit. 1656. When the prosecutions of Jesuits and Popish Priests were set on foot, though, it was well known, without the King's cordial consent, Sir *Dudley Carleton* apprized the King, that he "had intelligence in *Spain*, that the Priests were comforting themselves with this, that if he went on against them, they "would soon get rid of him." *Burnet*, Hist. O. T. vol. I. p. 11. The *Irish* Massacre, without inquiring how far it was or was not encouraged by King *Charles I*, is sufficient to prove the wicked practices of Papists, and to characterise the spirit of Popery during his reign, even though we should consign to disregard and oblivion some, otherwise atrocious, attempts of the Queen and her partizans to introduce Popery among our forefathers of that day. It has been mentioned, in order to exculpate the Dissenters from the church of *England*, particularly the Presbyterians, from the guilt of having had any hand in the death of *Charles I*, that this event was chiefly brought about by the Papists, and particularly that one or more Jesuits were seen about the scaffold in the garb of soldiers, with drawn swords, and were observed to express their joy as soon as the fatal blow

ing out Heresy in *England*, and planting Popery in its room, that several attempts were made to remove this Prince out of the way, in which, as it is credibly reported, they were at length successful §.

was given, by waving their hats, &c. I own, I could never see what end the death of *Charles I* could answer to the Papists, unless they were in the secret of the son's religion, and imagined that the immediate restoration of that Prince must be the consequence of taking his Father out of the way. And even then the state of the nation was such at that time, that the Papists must have wanted common sense if they could not have perceived that it was impossible, even for a professed Papist upon the throne, to do more for them than King *Charles I* had done, or was willing to do. That the Presbyterians were not accessory to the King's death, that the most respectable of them opposed and would have prevented it, is notorious from the most authentic remains of history. It could therefore be of no real service to *them*, to throw the odium of it upon the Papists. They were fairly acquitted of having any hand in that catastrophe, and after that it could not at all concern *their* reputation who were or who were not the authors or the abettors of it. If any one is curious to see the particulars of this charge upon the Papists, he may consult *La Politique du Clergé de France*, A la Haye, 1682, p. 105, where there is a circumstantial narrative of a negotiation with the Pope for the purpose of taking off King *Charles*, as the readiest means of re-establishing Popery. The misfortune is, that of any connexion the negotiators had with the immediate actors in that tragic affair, there is not the least evidence.

§ See Dr. *Harris's History of Charles II.* vol. II. p. 376. Remark [GGGG]. — The reality of the Popish Plot has been much questioned, chiefly upon the little credit due to *Oates*, *Bedloe*, and some other witnesses, upon whose evidence several of the supposed conspirators suffered death. And the argument
King

King *James II* was more of a bigot, and could neither reconcile himself nor his priests to the

against the reality of the Plot stands thus. *Oates*, and *Bedloe*, and others were perjured in some instances, therefore the whole of their testimony was false, therefore there was no Popish Plot. “But what occasion have we for *Oates* and *Bedloe* “to prove this conspiracy? Let us, if you please, lay these men “out of the case, and judge of it only by *Coleman’s* Letters to “Father *La Chaise* and others. These Letters are acknowledged “to be genuine, nor are denied by *Coleman* himself. There is “one to the Pope’s Nuncio at *Brussels*, dated *August 2^d*, 1674, “which says in express words, that the design prospered so well, “that he doubted not but in a little time the business would “be managed to the utter ruin of the Protestant-party. Can “any thing be stronger than what *Coleman* says in one of his “Letters to Father *La Chaise*? viz. *We have here a mighty work “upon our hands, no less than the conversion of three kingdoms, “and by that, perhaps, the utter subduing of a pestilent Heresy, “which has domineered over great part of this northern world a “long time; there were never such hopes of success since the death “of Queen Mary, as now in our days.* And towards the end “of the Letter he vehemently solicits Father *La Chaise* to obtain succours of money and arms for the execution of the “grand design.” I cite this from the *French* pamphlet above-mentioned [*La Politique du Clergé de France*, p. 118.] for a particular reason to be given by and by: in the mean time, I must observe, that it is a mistake in the *Frenchman* (who was Mr. *Jurieu*) that *Coleman* solicited for arms; the only aid and assistance he wanted for the present, was that of money, which was to be applied to the necessities of the King, that he might not need supplies from a parliament so disaffected to Popery, but proceed immediately to dissolve it. The rest is perfectly agreeable to the authentic account in *Coleman’s* trial. Soon after the publication of this pamphlet, it fell into the hands of the famous Mr. *Arnauld* (who then lay concealed in the Low
flow

flow precarious methods of bringing in Popery by political intrigue. His religion, he thought,

Countries), “and excited his indignation to that degree, that
 “he laid aside his controversy with Father *Malebranche*, and
 “determined, as much as in him lay, to vindicate the honour
 “of the church of *France*, against the falsehood and artifices
 “of the seditious writer of the *Politique*, and to justify, as
 “much as possible, *the innocence of the Catholics of England*.
 “For this purpose he published, in the year 1681, *An Apology*
 “*for the Catholics*, in two parts.” *Nouvelles de Republique des*
Lettres, Septembre 1681, p. 110. In that part of his Apo-
 logy which related to the *English Catholics*, he had thrown out
 some reflections on Sir *Robert Southwell’s* evidence at *Coleman’s*
 trial, which Sir *Robert* highly resented; and *Arnauld* hearing
 that that gentleman had complained of the injustice done him
 in the *Apology for the Catholics*, “immediately offered him
 “such satisfaction as should be judged convenient; and after
 “he [*Arnauld*] had seen the proofs of Sir *Robert Southwell’s*
 “innocence, he wrote to him in the most humble and ingenuous
 “manner for the reparation of his honour; and to the end
 “that the affair might become public, he desired one of his
 “friends to cause every thing that had passed relating to this
 “explanation to be printed. Mr. *Arnauld* was obliged in this
 “request, and there was printed a second addition to the first
 “part of the *Apology for the Catholics*, in which addition
 “are found the letters which Mr. *Arnauld* had written upon
 “the subject, and the answers of Sir *Robert Southwell*, toge-
 “ther with the pieces which justified the innocence of the
 “latter.” *Nouvelles de Republique des Lettres*, May 1686, p.
 504. The accusation related to Sir *Robert Southwell’s* evidence
 at *Coleman’s* trial, as abovementioned, which, no doubt, had
 been misreported to Mr. *Arnauld*, and, on that account, laid
 him under the disagreeable necessity of retracting his censure,
 and asking pardon. As I have not seen *Arnauld’s* *Apology*
 for the Catholics, nor have been able to procure it, I cannot
 obliged

obliged him, and his fovereign power, he imagined, authorized him, to establish his own faith

give any account of the particulars of *Arnauld's* charge, or of Sir *Robert Southwell's* defence; and I cannot help observing, that it is a little strange so remarkable a fact should have escaped the notice of all our historians who have written accounts of the Popish Plot. Sir *Robert Southwell* was clerk of the council, and was examined at *Coleman's* trial concerning the charge brought by *Oates* against *Coleman* before the king and council. Sir *Robert* there gave a clear ingenuous account, and confirmed that part of *Oates's* evidence relating to his knowledge of the treasonable nature of *Coleman's* correspondence with Father *La Chaise*, before *Coleman's* papers were examined. This was giving *Oates* credit in a very material point, and went a great way towards verifying that part of his evidence against the Jesuits, relating to the papers and letters he had seen, which were not forth-coming. It was not sufficient, in this case, for the Papists to discredit *Oates's* testimony, unless they could set aside that of Sir *Robert Southwell* too; and this consideration will effectually account for the false intelligence *Arnauld* had received concerning Sir *Robert's* evidence at *Coleman's* trial. Mr. *Bayle* says, "that this retraction, when Mr. *Arnauld's* " History should be written, would not make the least glorious " part of it." But as *Arnauld* was not always so ingenuous in his controversies, one might perhaps account for his candor on this occasion upon a different motive than that of a desire of doing justice to Protestants. The Jesuits and their agents and dependents were chiefly accused of forming and carrying on the conspiracy against *Charles II.* How little Mr. *Arnauld* was concerned for *their* honour, all the world knows; and possibly enough might not be displeased with having this opportunity of exposing to the public what lengths of falsehood and misrepresentation they would go, when the honour of so zealous a disciple as *Coleman* was at stake. From the efforts of the Papists to calumniate Sir *Robert Southwell* in this instance, we
by

by the most open and undisguised acts of power. In these attempts he was impolitic enough to let

may perceive how diligent they were to remove every circumstance out of sight which might fix upon them the odium of so foul a conspiracy. But all in vain. Allow *Oates* and *Bedloe* to be perjured in some instances, their evidence is confirmed in others by such notorious facts and circumstances, and by the joint testimony of persons of so respectable characters, that no reasonable doubt can remain but that they were conscious with the persons they accused of a detestable conspiracy to subvert the religion and liberties of *Great Britain*. At the same time we have *Coleman's* papers, which shew how few scruples they had concerning the *means*. His letters to Father *La Chaise* discover the rancor of his heart towards the *Northern Heresy*. He plumes himself upon the hopes of seeing the utter ruin of the Protestant party, and a return of the glorious days of *Queen Mary*. And yet when he comes to draw a declaration for the King, wherein reasons were to be given for the dissolution of the parliament, he could talk of *the beauty and splendor of the true Protestant Church of England*, and make his Majesty speak in a style of the greatest affection for it, with expressions of a suitable aversion to Popery. But all this was for the service of the Catholic cause, and a case for which a dispensation might easily be had. In the mean while, these counterpaces of *Coleman* have an unlucky aspect upon the asseverations of the Jesuits at their execution, and the oaths of the scholars of *St. Omers*; "from whence," says a foreign writer, "a number of libels have issued against *Oates* and *Bedloe*, and we on this side the water are to be persuaded that this whole business depends entirely on the testimony of two flagitious rascals." *Les derniers efforts de l'Innocence affligée*, p. 102. How exactly does this tally with the false intelligence conveyed to Mr. *Arnauld*? and, no doubt, if the same occasions had fallen out in other cases, more of these calumnies would have been detected. These pieces of foreign History of a domestic
the

the nation see, that Popery was always the same, a cruel, intolerant, but at the same time a treacherous and hypocritical system, which, to compass its ends, could put on the mask of unlimited toleration on some occasions, even while on others it was breaking through every sacred fence of law and justice, to plant its votaries where their influence was most likely to undermine the principal supports of the Protestant Religion. It is no wonder that these insults upon the constitution should provoke a general desertion of all his subjects, who valued the blessings of religious and civil liberty as they deserved. The consequence was, a general invitation to the Prince of *Orange* to undertake our deliverance, and the expulsion of the bigoted violator of the laws and liberties of a free and brave people.

transaction, the Papists are now bringing home, to discredit, if they can, the authentic records of their own country. At this very time they are sneering the Popish Plot, in their factious publications, as the mere fiction of *Oates* and *Bedloe*, just as their worthy predecessors of *St. Omers* did in their day. Even now, while I am writing this, the *London Chronicle* of July 21 is brought me, wherein is an extract from *Voltaire's* Commentary on *Beccaria's* Essay on Crimes and Punishments, exhibiting a most false and invidious account of *Oates's* evidence against *Coleman*, and taking it for granted that there were no other witnesses to prove the Popish Plot upon the Jesuits but *Oates* and *Bedloe*. But their misery is, that, as they cannot support their superstition till they can destroy the faith of the Bible, so neither can they vindicate their social or political principles, till they can destroy the faith of all civil history.

It

It may well be supposed, that this was an event the Papists could not brook with any patience. Accordingly they immediately fell to work to bring back first their abdicated Prince, and after his demise, his Popish representatives, and all with a view of finishing the hopeful work which was interrupted, so happily for us, at the Revolution ^h.

^h The various plots to assassinate King *William*, which are of too recent date to be denied, and other attempts of a less criminal appearance indeed, but still undertaken with the avowed purpose of subverting the protestant government, have been represented as the mere effect of a political struggle for power, or, at worst, of principles common to Protestants with the Papists. But this I deny. To talk of the religion of some of the profligates who engaged in these *laudable* services, would be a mere jest; and as for those who adhered to the nonjuring clergy, they were indeed no other than a sect of Popery, who stopped short at a few idolatrous circumstances in the popish worship, just as our Protestant Dissenters do at some ceremonies in the Church of *England*. This appears from the principles of *Lesley* and many others who have written in defence of that system. See Bp. Burnet's *Introduction* to the third volume of his *History of the Reformation*, p. xxii. King *James II.* himself, it seems, bigot as he was, had some scruples concerning the lawfulness of that murderous project, of which one *Jones* was to have been the wicked instrument in 1690, but was at length *satisfied both in CONSCIENCE and HONOUR*. Burnet, Hist. O. T. vol. II. p. 56. And upon the very same principles which satisfied the Popish Bigot, were *Friend* and *Parkins* absolved by three of the Catholic nonjuring Clergy, in the year 1696, at the place of execution, though the criminals *expressed no sort of repentance for the ill designs they had been engaged in, and which they owned*, *ibid.* p. 174. The healing
From

From this period the Papists have had an additional cause of enmity to the *British* Government.

circumstance was, that King *William's* heresy, and the dignity of the Catholic Church, were equally objects to both parties. In the same manner must be accounted for all the plots in Queen *Anne's* reign, that of Sir *John Maclean* in 1704. *Hooke's* negotiations, and *Fourbin's* expedition to *Scotland* in 1708. The intrigues of the Jacobites and Papists during the four last years of her reign. The Rebellion in 1715. The Conspiracy of Count *Gyttemburgh* and Baron *Gortz*, that of *Atterbury* and *Layer*. The Rebellion in 1745, in which were engaged some of the same persons who had appeared in arms for the old Pretender thirty years before. So that from the accession of Queen *Elizabeth*, to the last hour of *George II*, we have a chain of facts, by which it appears that the Pretenders's motto, *Sequi, finemque tueri*, has ever been the *mot de guerre* of the whole Popish party who have had any interest in, or any connexion with this kingdom from the time of the Reformation, even under all their disappointments. We are now, however, to believe that under the present reign they are the most dutiful of all the denominations of *British* subjects, and particularly that they take the principles of political obedience from their religion. This we learn from *Messieurs Brook* and the author of the *Considerations on the Penal Laws*, &c. And to make this a clear case, Father *Philips*, in an *Appendix* to his *History of Cardinal Pole*, just published, has undertaken to give us a detail of those principles from the *Scriptures*; but, like an experienced veteran, artfully keeps to *generals*, without once touching the true point in which we want satisfaction. For who ever denied, that the *Scriptures* enjoined submission and obedience to the supreme legislative powers? Or who ever imagined, that the Papists were not disposed to pay a dutiful submission to those whom they esteem the *supreme powers*, whether in consequence of the *Scripture* injunctions or not? If a Jesuit were to be asked, why he is

Before

Before the Revolution they were enemies to the Protestant Sovereigns of *Great Britain*, only be-

disposed to obey the General of his order, preferably to any other power, he would doubtless alledge these Scriptures, having previously informed you that the government of his society is the *legal* government to which he is bound to submit. Now Mr. *Philips* himself hath limited his scriptural obedience to *legal* government; but whether he esteems the present government of *Great Britain* a *legal* government, he saith not. If therefore he should be of opinion, that *some foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, and ought to have, jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm*, it is certain, that so far as such *jurisdiction, &c.* is excluded, by the laws of this realm, the government of this realm, must, in the estimation of Mr. *Philips*, be *illegal*. And if the foreign power, to which he assigns such *jurisdiction*, should happen to be that of the Bishop of *Rome*, all the texts of scripture he hath cited, and all his reasoning upon them, such as it is, must be *ultimately* referred by him to the Pope, so that King *George* shall no longer be intitled to Mr. *Philips's* obedience than the Pope chuses he should. If Mr. *Philips* should say, that the Pope's having jurisdiction in matters *ecclesiastical or spiritual*, leaves the supreme *civil* power still entire in the hands of the King and Parliament of *Great Britain*, we shall desire to know, whether, in Mr. *Philips's* opinion, the Pope may not, in every place where he hath *spiritual* jurisdiction, exercise *civil* jurisdiction likewise, *in ordine ad spiritualia*? If yea, I desire to know what Mr. *Philips's* civil obedience to King *George* III is worth above three farthings, whenever the interests of the Church of *Rome* come in question? If he thinks the Pope hath not *civil* jurisdiction, &c. within this realm *in any case*, we desire to know how he will acquit Cardinal *Pole* of high treason in acting under his legantine powers, before the statute restoring the Pope's authority was passed? Surely Mr. *Philips* will be under no difficulty to explain him,

cause

cause they *were* Protestants. The line of succession came not into the question. It was suffi-

self upon matters so plain and obvious. In the mean time, he will easily find credit with us, that *what he hath advanced will be disowned by very few or none of those who profess the same Religion*, because every word of it might have been owned by *Garnet*, at the very moment he was absolving the gun-powder conspirators. Mr. *Philips* is exceedingly provoked at somebody who "charges him with taking an infamous pleasure in "asperging and blackening the manners of the Reformers by "false representations." *Appendix*, p. 29. Hath he replied to this charge? Hath he acquitted himself of it? Not in the least. It is fixed upon him by his accuser, and is immoveable and indelible. And though he so highly resents the imputation, he is so far from being *ashamed* of the practice, that he is at the same dirty work again in this very *Appendix*, p. 15. where, upon the credit of one Mr. *Nicholas Faunt*, "a voucher above exception, and one of the conspicuous characters of that and "the following reign," we are told, that Queen *Elizabeth's* court, was a scene of all enormities, where wickedness reigned in the highest degree; "a memorable contrast," says Mr. *Philips*, "of the regularity of Queen *Mary's*." A strong argument, no doubt, against the Reformation! Will Mr. *Philips* allow us to try the force of it in *Scotland*, in the court of another Queen *Mary*? But what? All enormities in the court of Queen *Elizabeth*, and none in that of Queen *Mary*? Yes, one, which was not in *Elizabeth's* court, and a more flagitious enormity, by ten degrees, than ever was in it. I mean a spirit of inhuman bigotry and four superstition, diabolically delighting in sacrificing unhappy innocents to the idols of *Rome Papal*, the parent and nurse of more abominations than *Rome Pagan*. Much good may it do Mr. *Philips* with such regularity. But can he wonder that they who did not admire it so much as he may do, should be a little joyous (*licentiously* joyous if he pleases), that this female bigot was taken away from the court, and that access was

G

cient



cient for the justification of their discontents and conspiracies, that the Government was in the hands of an Heretic, without enquiring into his

now opened to a prince of a different disposition, and before whom the countenances of the *Gardiners* and the *Bonnors* were no longer seen? The court of *Charles II* was the court of a Popish King, and was, at least, as fruitful in enormities and wickedness as the court of *Elizabeth*. When the corruptions of that court were objected to, the excuse was, that "no wonder the odium of the hypocritical formalities of the preceding times should transport people to the contrary extreme;" an excuse which was just as good in the mouths of Queen *Elizabeth's* courtiers as in the mouths of King *Charles's*. What would Mr. *Philips* think of an historian who should say, that "the licentiousness of K. *Charles's* court was a memorable contrast to the regularity of *Oliver Cromwell's*," by way of insinuating that *Independency* is a religion of more regularity than Popery? After all, Mr. *Philips* is not out of his road in making these observations. It is his view to gain proselytes, and nothing more taking with the herd than these insinuations. It is a kind of historical Legerdemain, which excites admiration, at the same time that it deceives the eye. This indeed, as far as I have seen, is Mr. *Philips's* Fort. He should never stir out of it. He hath begun his Appendix, for example, with a *Dissertation on the authority of the Latin Edition of the Scripture, called the Vulgate*, wherein he proposes to ascertain the sense in which the Council of Trent has declared the Latin Vulgate Edition of the Scripture to be Authentic. Here he hath stepped into the province of the casuistical Critic; with how little success, may be seen in the Monthly Record of Literature for September, and in the Monthly Review for October 1767. The design of these professions of submission to a Protestant Government, on principles so seemingly different from those entertained by Papists heretofore, is without doubt to persuade us that we may be perfectly assured, they are not now engaged in any machinations to disturb our Govern-

Title

Title by descent, wherein perhaps, had there been any defect, the Faith of a Roman Catholic Prince might have made it whole.

ment; a circumstance which may possibly be better known to those, to whose lot it may fall to write the History of the present times twenty years hence, than it is to us at this day. If they have no views but of peace and quietness, and submission to the Powers that be, whence comes their extraordinary assiduity at this particular period in making converts? Whence their petulant scoffs, their insults, and even their menaces, to those who oppose their progress in this work? Have the Papists of this day more zeal for the souls of men than they who lived ten or twenty years ago? This we should be more ready to believe, if we made no observations on the manners and conversation of those they employ in this business, or on the means they make use of for the purpose. Some of the less prudent among them have made their boast (as is observed above) that they were sure of the indulgence of the Government, notwithstanding any complaints that might be made of their audacious contempt of the laws enacted to suppress the practice of proselyting. Have they, in return, given the Government any of those pledges of their allegiance which their forefathers refused to give? Have they given any evidence that they have changed their principles on this head, on which it is fit for the guardians of the Protestant settlement of the Crown to rely? Must not every proselyte they make espouse the same principles? Every man of common sense, who is in the least acquainted with the principles of Popery, can give himself satisfactory answers to these questions. Upon what grounds then can the Papists pretend to this indulgence? Can they expect it from the Guardians of the Protestant religion in *Great Britain*, while they abide by these principles? If not, wherein have they shewn that the alteration of their principles hath intitled them to this indulgence? I have observed in some of the papers published on behalf of the Papists, an argument drawn from the permission given some time ago for the residence of a Popish Bishop in *Canada*, in favour of the suppo-

But now that they who pretend a claim to the Crown of these realms, as the lineal successors of the House of *Stuart*, are bred in the Roman

sition, that the Government have not the apprehensions of the bad effects of the Popish principles of the present times, which are entertained by some of their over-zealous adversaries. Into the true reasons for this permission I presume not to inquire. But if the reasons given for it in some of our public prints may be depended upon, namely, that it was granted “in consideration of the *French* Court’s engaging not to abet or assist in any shape the son of the Pretender” [see the *London Chronicle* of August 2, 1766], there could hardly be a stronger instance of the distrust the Government had at that time of the principles and dispositions of our domestic Papists. There is not a man of sense in the kingdom, who would not express his contempt for all the efforts *France* could make in favour of the Pretender, if the whole people of *Great Britain* were unanimous in their affections for our most gracious Sovereign upon the throne, and equally and cordially zealous for the support of his government; and this indeed we have reason to hope is the case with all *British* Protestants. It is in the highest degree probable, that, without the encouragement the *French* have had from time to time from the Popish party in our own country, they would never have concerned themselves (whatever they might occasionally profess), actually to attempt any thing in favour of the Pretender. But the experience we have had of the temper and principles of the Popish adherents of the Pretender, and whither they have always been looking for assistance, is surely sufficient to put us upon our guard against any future mischief that might arise from such dispositions; and was doubtless the motive which prevailed at that period to have that door shut against Popish influence, by a measure which otherwise perhaps might not have appeared quite unexceptionable. Of that I pretend not to judge. But whatever the case of a distant colony, in the circumstances that *Canada* was before our conquest of it, might be, no precedent can be drawn from it in favour of any such measure at
Catholic

Catholic Religion, and are superseded likewise by the settlement of the Crown in a Protestant family, the illustrious Princes of the House of *Hanover*; the Kings of *Great Britain* become obnoxious to the Papists, not only as reputed Heretics, but as breaking in upon the hereditary right of their favourite family, as hath sufficiently appeared by the several manifestos which were published by the late Pretender and his son, to justify the two last Rebellionsⁱ.

home; and arguments of this kind only serve to shew the encroaching nature of Popish pretensions, and to raise very reasonable suspicions that they would extend them in the present case much farther than merely to the free exercise of their religion. It is said, the Roman Catholics in *Canada* have seminaries allowed, as well as a Bishop. The former indeed seems to be necessarily implied in the permission to have the latter. The destructive tendency of such permission at home, to the very being of our constitution, need not be told. The public hath already been apprized of it from other hands [See the *Appendix*, N^o III.]. Though I do not believe that the *French* can either impose the Pretender, or their religion upon us, without the aid of the Popish party at home; yet I would not undertake to say what that party might not be able to do without the *French*, were they allowed to have their seminaries, and to exercise the discipline usually practised in them, with the same freedom in this kingdom, as they enjoy them in Popish countries.

ⁱ The Papists, on both these occasions, were very solicitous to make the Protestants believe, that no alteration of the established religion was intended. With respect to the Rebellion in 1715, the following anecdote from an unexceptionable witness affords the fullest proof to the contrary. "He [the Pretender] "was so afraid of admitting any words [into his Declaration] "which might be construed into a promise of his consenting to

The Penal Laws against the Papists, in this view, appear to be no more than necessary to secure the Protestant settlement of the Crown of *Great Britain*, and, by consequence, the Rights and Liberties of *British* subjects, against the effects of principles so destructive of our happy constitution. And it is to little purpose to complain of their severity, when we have so often experienced that even that severity hath not been sufficient to discourage the attempts of the Popish party, whenever they had a prospect of succeeding in bringing about the ruin of our Religion and Liberties; and when we consider that, in all human probability, nothing but this very severity

“those things, which should be found necessary for the present
 “or future security of our constitution, that in a paragraph
 “where he was made to say, that he thought himself obliged to
 “be solicitous for the prosperity of the church of *England*, the
 “word *prosperity* was expunged; and we left, by this mental re-
 “servation, to guess what he was solicitous for. It could not be
 “for her *prosperity*; *that* he had expunged. It must therefore
 “be for her *destruction*, which, in his language, would have been
 “stiled her *conversion*.” *Bolingbroke's* Letter to Sir *W. Windham*,
 p. 284, where more may be seen to the same purpose. His
 Declaration in 1745 was in terms equally equivocal. “By his
 “promising (says a sensible Remarker on this latter Declaration)
 “to maintain his Protestant subjects in the free exercise of their
 “Religion conformable to the Laws of the land, must be under-
 “stood, not the laws since the *Usurpation*, but those of his
 “Father, who sent a Popish Army to root out the Presbyte-
 “rians [of *Scotland*] with the most rigorous prosecution.” *Hender-
 son's* Hist. Rebellion 1745, p. 24. See likewise the excellent
 Remarks of the *Occasional Writer*, on this Declaration.

of the Penal Laws has prevented them from succeeding. To tolerate men with such principles, and with no more restraint than is laid upon Protestant Dissenters (whose principles and affections are well known to be friendly to the civil and religious rights of mankind in general, and to our own government in particular), would be to nourish in our bosom a nest of vipers, prepared to subvert our constitution whenever an opportunity should offer, which they could hardly want a year to an end, were they to obtain the full Toleration for which they are pleading.

But it is said, if you exclude them from Toleration merely on account of their political doctrines, why do you molest them in their religious worship, shut up their Mass-houses, and prosecute their Priests, who are merely ecclesiastical officers?

To this I answer: 1. Whenever the Papists will openly and candidly disavow those political principles which render them obnoxious to our civil Government, we shall then be able to distinguish between those principles and their religious opinions. In the present state of Popery, both sorts of doctrine are so intimately incorporated with each other, as not to admit of any separation, till they shall think fit to make it themselves. In the mean time, every Papist is of course an enemy to the *British* constitution, and the guardians of that constitution have no way of knowing who is

or is not a Papist, but by his practising Popish rites and devotions.

2. The Priests of that communion are known, by the authentic forms which invest them with their function, to be more especially bound to an implicit obedience to a foreign and inimical jurisdiction, with an express exclusion of all subjection to an *heretical* government. A Popish priest is accordingly known to be an enemy to our government, by the same tokens that discover him to be a priest. And hence it is that his saying or singing Mass brings him within the reach of the Penal Laws, without farther evidence. But,

3. Except in this single instance, no Papist is convicted upon this presumptive evidence. A Lay-papist, even though arms should be found in his house, is not amenable to the Penal Laws, till he becomes a *Recusant Convict*. And here the trial is totally of a civil nature, namely, by tendering him the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; which if he refuses, neither the law of nature or of nations will allow that he should be continued in the protection of that government from which he withholds this equitable security, and that with a view of being more at liberty to overturn it.

These considerations naturally suggest to us of the clergy, what is our own duty in respect to our vigilance over those who are more immediately under our inspection in a religious light.

Principles

Principles of rebellion are not, we are certain, the principles of Christianity ; and every thing of that sort which is taught under the name of religion, must have the worst effects upon the dispositions and manners of those who learn and espouse them, as they implant in their minds a persuasion that they are doing God service by such practices, as they might see, if they were permitted to consult the word of God, are abomination to him.

It is therefore our duty to lay before our people the pernicious consequences of Popish doctrines, both on account of their present mischief in human society, and their tendency to defeat the future hopes of every individual who is corrupted by them. Every convert to Popery is a double loss. He is lost, in the first place, to the glorious liberty of the sons of God, and becomes a slave to a base and sordid superstition, which exercises an imperious tyranny over his conscience, and fetters him once more in that bondage and darkness, from which the light of the Gospel was intended to set him free. He is lost, in the next place, as an affectionate and obedient subject to a most gracious King, and a most eligible constitution of Government ; and inlists himself in a pernicious confederacy to subvert the rights and liberties which depend upon them.

These endeavours of the clergy, however, must be understood to be required chiefly within our own province, which directs us to no other means
of

of instruction but the force of reason, and the evidence of scripture. I need hardly mention, that the means of suppressing Popery in the hands of the civil Magistrate, and of a Christian Clergy respectively, are very different. Popery, as we have seen, is convicted by a set of destructive principles, and a thousand overt-acts justified by them, of aiming at the subversion of every thing that supports the freedom and privileges of *British* Protestants, and in these circumstances precludes itself from every reasonable pretension to Toleration, either in a civil or a religious sense. The laws have therefore most wisely impowered the civil Magistrate to stop its progress in every attempt to extend its influence upon any pretence whatsoever.

But the weapons of a Christian and a Protestant clergy are not carnal. To guard the civil liberties of mankind from the conspiracies of a desperate faction, and to watch over the people, that they be not corrupted in their religious principles, belong to two different departments. The latter is peculiar to our profession, and our rule and direction for discharging it are in the holy scriptures alone.

The clergy indeed, as dutiful fellow-subjects with their flocks, are bound to co-operate with the ministers of God for their good, in *every* province. But their proper business is to labour in the word and doctrine; and the whole force of the

the charge upon them, which I have mentioned above, turns upon the supposition that if they had done their duty faithfully in their own department, and had been diligent and frequent in laying before the people those proofs and evidences from holy writ, which shew in the clearest manner the various impostures of Popery, and the great spiritual danger of being deluded by them, it would not have been in the power of those wicked emissaries, who compass sea and land to make profelytes to the Pope, to pervert the people from their civil allegiance, or to engage them in any evil design to bereave them of those inestimable rights and privileges to which they are intitled, both as the disciples of Christ, and the free subjects of the Crown of *Great Britain*.

It has been asserted, and upon no weak presumption, that if there should be a man of common sense so circumstanced as to have no other way of coming at a complete view of the design and tendency of the gospel of Christ, he might have it very sufficiently, by putting down a list of doctrines the reverse of those taught in the church of *Rome*, and particularly those upon which she builds her exclusive authority. And indeed no great wonder. For a religion where *Idolatry* is practised and encouraged in so many gross instances, and whose aim and end is to establish an arbitrary dominion over the human mind, for so many lucrative and sensual purposes, could but maintain

maintain its reputation for a very little while, without those slavish traditions of the Pharisaical kind, and the superstitious pageantry of Paganism, which our blessed Saviour condemned, and came on earth to abolish ^k.

^k Perhaps there is not any more effectual way of securing our people from the snares laid for them by Popish Priests and other emissaries employed by them, than to point out to them the severe denunciations of the wrath of God against *Idolatry* under all its forms and disguises, with which the scriptures both of the Old and New Testament abound, and to confront them with the worship of the Papists exhibited in their Books of Devotion. The simplest man alive, who has common sense, and reads these passages in his Bible, can hardly be imposed upon by the most artificial glosses the Advocates for Popery can put upon so evident a contempt of the word of God. There have been, and there possibly may be still, members of the church of *England*, who have been backward to impute *Idolatry* to the church of *Rome*, from what apparent motives I forbear to mention. “But, “saith Bishop *Stillingfleet*, I cannot see why the authority of “some very few persons, though of great learning, should bear “sway against the constant opinion of our church ever since the “Reformation.” This learned Bishop hath indeed himself fallen under the reprehension of an eminent Prelate of the present times, for endeavouring to fix *Idolatry* upon the church of *Rome* by an incompetent argument. “The Advocates of the “church of *Rome*,” says this learned writer, “to evade the charge “of *Idolatry*, with which they are urged by the *Reformed*, pretend that this crime consists in giving the worship due to the “supreme God to inferior beings. The excellent Bishop *Stillingfleet*, in opposing this subterfuge, attempted to prove that “the most civilized Pagans, who are confessed to be Idolaters, “did not give the honours due to the *first Cause* to their inferior Gods; the *first Cause*, as he pretends, being worshiped “by them as such. An assertion, which, if true, would con-

It

It is true, we have one disadvantage in our circumstances, which cannot be mentioned without regret; and that is, that our common people in general have not only a very slender acquaintance

“fute all that the Prophets and the Apostles say concerning the
“state and condition of the Pagan world.” *Doctrine of Grace*,
p. 248. Ed. 2d. The learned Prelate calls this pretence of the
Papists a *subterfuge*, from whence it is reasonable to conclude,
that, in his opinion, the Papists are nevertheless guilty of Idol-
latry, though Bishop *Stillingfleet*’s argument should go upon a
false fact. But if we take the word of the Papists, who should
know their own intentions the best, that they never give supreme
honour to inferior beings, I do not see how this learned Prelate
would, upon his own state of the case, convict them of Idolatry.
For if in *all* that the Prophets and Apostles have said concerning
the state and condition of the Pagan world, no instance can be
brought where the civilized Pagans worshiped their inferior Gods
with honours inferior to those with which they worshiped the
first Cause, that species of worship will not be to be found in
the whole Bible, and consequently cannot there be condemned
as *Idolatry*. Surely this is a case which well deserves to be
cleared up more at length. When the same learned hand found
fault with Dr. *Middleton* for deriving the superstitions of Popery
from those of Paganism, the Doctor was still living to vindicate
his hypothesis; and accordingly set all right in a small compass.
In the present case, Dr. *Stillingfleet* is long since dead and gone,
and few have survived him who have had the same extensive
reach in sacred and prophane learning. It would be hard upon
his memory, if his learned labours upon this subject might be
overthrown by a bare counter-assertion without particular proof.
His argument is certainly friendly to the Protestant cause, and
it would be equally hard to deprive us of the benefit of it,
merely out of deference to an admired name. I therefore can-
not but hope that this learned and ingenious Prelate will speedily
make good his proposition by a particular demonstration, that
we may know what we have to trust to.

with

with the scriptures, but likewise seem in no great degree desirous to improve their little stock of knowledge of this kind, or to be sensible how much they may suffer for the want of it. Their ignorance accordingly, as may well be expected, makes them slow in apprehending arguments drawn from the word of God, and much in the dark with respect to controverted points, the decision of which depends upon that kind of proof, when such matters come in their way. Hence they are liable to be deceived by those who, observing their natural turn and disposition, are ready to humour them in their own way.

There is nothing that Popish converters dislike so much in the course of their occupation, as to meet with an enlightened mind. Their common cant is there of no service to them, and they are driven into distresses for which they are not prepared. Whereas Ignorance gives them all the advantages they can desire. Ignorance is weak, credulous, and superstitious; easily terrified with such phantoms and bugbears as *Romish* craftsmen well know how to raise, and easily allured likewise with hopes and promises of present and future good things, which the inventions of men have stored up in the fantastic treasury of the church of *Rome*. And when these artifices and delusions meet with the secular spirit of one, who desires to indulge with the good things of this life, without losing his hopes of happiness in the
next,

next, he readily gives up his privilege of examining spiritual things for himself, and will think himself obliged to an officious priest who will undertake to secure his salvation for him, without more trouble on his own part than that of going through a few superstitious forms on solemn occasions, which the most immoral man upon earth may practise with as much ease, and as good effect, as the most pious and sincere Christian.

But from the beginning of the Reformation it was not so. The common people of that time were not so to be ensnared. The scriptures had for a long time been locked up from them in an unknown tongue ; and when, by the care of their reformed pastors, the Bible was translated into *English*, it is almost incredible with what avidity the poor people applied themselves to the reading of it. Readers indeed in those days were but scarce ; and happy was the company who could meet with a person with an audible voice, and a distinct pronounciation, that would read the scriptures to them. Our histories give us accounts of the vast crowds of people who attended such meetings in *Paul's Church*, and other places, where *English Bibles* were provided for that purpose¹.

¹ See *Strype's Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer*, p. 64, *sub anno* 1538. *Heylin's Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 9 and 20, and *Fuller's Church History*, book vii. p. 387 ; who tells us, that " Few country-parishes could go to the cost of this *Bible*

This happened in the reigns of K. *Henry VIII* and K. *Edward VI*; and what proficiency the people made in Christian knowledge, by this application and attention to the word of God, appears by the readines, good sense, and solidity, with which even some of the poorer sort answered the Popish doctors, who were appointed to question them on the subject of what was called their *Heresy*, in the barbarous reign of Queen *Mary*.

Nothing can be more desireable than that the common people may once more return to the same disposition, and arm themselves with the word of God against deceivers of all sorts. One may safely venture to say that their victories over the crafty sophisters of the church of *Rome* would be easy

“ of the greater volume [printed by *Grafton*, 1541]; but that
 “ Bishop *Bonner* caused six of them to be chained in the church
 “ of *St. Paul*, in convenient places.” See likewise *Burnet*,
Reform. vol. II. p. 249. and concerning the prohibition of *Tin-*
dal's Translation, see *Burnet*, *Reform.* vol. III. p. 5. The story
 both of this prohibition, and of the allowance of the other edi-
 tions, is told by all these historians (*Strype* excepted) with little
 accuracy, and not without some confusion; which is the more
 remarkable, as *Fox* (who was prior to them all) hath given a
 most circumstantial account of this whole matter in his *Martyro-*
logy, vol. II. p. 1086, 1087. *Fox* says, that *Bonner* promised
Grafton the printer, at *Paris*, that he would set up six of his
 Bibles in *St. Paul's*; but that he performed his promise, *Fox*
 saith not. Though, considering that *Bonner* was a retainer to
Cromwell, the patron of *Grafton's* Bible, it is not improbable
 but he might.

and

and cheap. They might then be left, with great security, to their own judgment, which will always then be the best informed, when men examine the evidences of truth and falsehood, by the diligent and sincere application of their own capacities and endeavours.

I have always considered the duty of Protestant teachers to consist chiefly in endeavouring to raise and revive this spirit of studying the scriptures in our respective flocks; but more particularly in opposition to the methods of stifling the truth, and discouraging free and impartial inquiries into it, which give the Popish clergy so many advantages over both their own people, and those they attempt to seduce. As we pretend to no authority to be believed upon our own word in matters of salvation, or to be governed by any precedents but those in the holy scriptures, it is for our credit and reputation, while we ourselves are honest and upright, that our hearers should be competent judges of what we deliver to them, which it is impossible they should be if they have little or no skill in the rule by which their judgments should be formed.

What I am here observing is more particularly true with respect to Popery. The errors of the church of *Rome* are not such only as arise from the controverted sense of particular passages of scripture, which is the case among those disagreeing sects to whom the scripture is the common

H

measure

measure of judgment. The insufficiency of scripture to furnish saving knowledge, and to decide controversies, is a fundamental doctrine of the church of *Rome*; nor are the propagators of Popery ever willingly brought to put their cause upon that test. But as the Protestants had early opened these fountains of instruction by free translations of them into the vulgar tongues of their respective countries, it became necessary for the Papists, in many cases, to obviate their objections by appeals to the same authority, and even (to prevent untoward suspicions in their own people) to give them a freer access to them, than before the Reformation they had allowed. This however they did not venture to do, till they had forewarned them, in some instances, of the little estimation due to the scriptures, and had, in others, corrupted and falsified them by such additions, omissions, and mistranslations, as might give them the air of countenancing their own superstition¹.

¹ For the grossest instances of the contempt of the scriptures in the *Roman* church, as well as among their private doctors, see a pamphlet, intituled *Popery an Enemy to Scripture*, by JAMES SERCES, Vicar of *Appleby* in *Lincolnshire*, printed for *Watts, Roberts, and Osborne*, 1736, p. 42, 43, &c. And for instances of foul corruption and falsification of the scriptures, see the same book, from p. 49 to p. 99. *Cartwright's* and *Fulk's* Confutation of the *Rhemist's* Translation, Glosses, and Annotations on the New Testament, abounds with examples of the same sort. Nor are instances wanting even in our own time and country. I have now before me an *English Testament* of the *Rhemish* Translation,

We object therefore to Popery, not as it is an erroneous sect of Christianity, but as it is an antichristian system of superstition, totally subver-

printed 1749, in twelves, with short notes, some of which are abridged from the *Rhemish* Annotators, and others added by a more modern hand; and likewise with considerable alterations in the text: as, *Matth. xi. 21.* where the old *Rhemists* have it, *would have done penance in beare-cloth* [hair-cloth], the modern Reviser has given it, *done penance in sack-cloth*. For though the poor ignorant *English* Catholics, for whose use this translation is calculated, might be taught to believe that the humiliation of the *Jews* here alluded to, was like the penances in the *Roman* church; yet that the *Jews* wore *hair-cloth* on those occasions would not be quite so easily believed; not to mention, that should this Translation by any untoward accident fall into the hands of Heretics, such an imposition might have made the Papists perfectly ridiculous. Thus far mere shame hath compelled them to do partial justice at least to the sacred text, even while they are corrupting it. For it is certain that these public Humiliations among the *Jews* were no more like the *Penances* in the *Roman* church, than an entire covering of sack-cloth is like a *Hair-shirt*. But in other instances our Revisor is more trusty to his cause. For whereas our Saviour says, *Matth. xv. 9,* according to our translation, *In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, lest this should be thought to bear hard upon the traditions of Popery, the Revisor hath thought proper to explain it away in the following note, abridged from the *Rhemish* Translators. “As to the rules and ordinances
“of holy church, touching Fasts, Festivals, &c. these are no
“ways repugnant to, but highly agreeable to God’s holy word,
“and all Christian piety. Neither are they to be counted
“amongst the doctrines and commandments of men, because
“they proceed not from mere human authority, but from that
“which Christ hath established in his church; whose Pastors he
“has commanded us to hear and obey, even as himself. St. *Luke*,

five of the truth as well as of the benefits of the gospel of Christ; attempting to transfer our faith and hopes of everlasting life from Christ the Rock of our salvation, to the sandy foundation of human authority, and precarious tradition. For as to what they tell us of their church deriving its authority from Christ, and their pastors from the Apostles in an uninterrupted succession, we have a surer way of judging these their pretensions, than by a chain of traditionary legends, namely, the direction of Christ himself to examine the merit of all such pretenders by their *fruits*; and by these it will appear that, instead of being the legitimate pastors of the Christian flock, they are rather the offspring of those *wolves in sheep's cloathing*, of whom our blessed Lord gave his disciples so many cautions to beware.

“x. 16. St. *Matt.* xviii. 17.” The *et cætera* above marked is a pregnant one, big with all the traditional doctrines of Popery, and renders this determination of our Saviour of none effect, just as the pharisaical traditions defeated the commandments of God. “We demand of you,” says *Cartwright* in his censure of this note, “whether it is your doctrine, that, although the parents should die in the street, yet may not their monkish daughters make a step out of their nunnery to save their lives? We suppose yourselves mutter some such thing upon *Matth.* viii. “22.” They do indeed more than mutter it; for these are their words: “By this we see, that not only no worldly or carnal respect, but *no other laudable duty towards our parents*, ought to stay us from following Christ, *and choosing a life of greater perfection.*” But every one knows, that, in the language of Popery, *a Life of Perfection* means the Life of a Monk or a Nun.

To

To obviate these base misrepresentations, it will become us to assert the honour and importance of our Christian scriptures, to labour earnestly with our people to have continual recourse to them, as the original records of whatever concerns our common salvation; to encourage them in the study of them, by pointing out the simplicity in which indispensable matters of faith are delivered in them, and the plainness and perspicuity of those precepts which concern our practical duty; to warn them of the woe denounced upon those who add to or take from them, and the danger of following blind guides, and hypocritical pretenders to authority under commissions of which the scriptures make no mention but to condemn them, and which, as those very scriptures warn us, are calculated for nothing but to promote imposture, to captivate the minds of those to whom Christ has given liberty from all spiritual dominion but his own, and to gratify the insatiable avarice and ambition of insolent, sordid, and self-interested men^m.

^m Among the many objections to Popery, there is none more striking to a reasonable ingenuous minds, than the MEANNESS which runs through all its peculiar doctrines and superstitions. One can hardly open any of their Rituals without being put in mind of St. Paul's BEGGARLY ELEMENTS, *Gal. iv. 9*, which all the pomp and parade of their ceremonies cannot disguise; and, as a certain judicious writer of our own country observes, "the rabble do usually cast their eyes upon, as children do on " the Lord Mayor's pageants; admiring the splendor of those

It is true, our duty calls us to oppose errors of all kinds as well as those of Popery. But we

“ that ride in them, who, considered in their own nature, are
 “ but mean men’s issue, and thus adorned at the City cost. Yet
 “ their external varnish doth so obstruct the organs of sense, as
 “ they do not perceive the poorness of the people that bear them
 “ up.” For who knows not that the magnificent implements, utensils, and ornaments, in use in the *Roman* church, have been collected by the contributions partly of ignorant and superstitious zealots, and partly of dying men and women, terrified or allured by the doctrines of Purgatory and Indulgences, to purchase their future peace at the hands of designing priests, who are base and abject enough to enrich their churches and fraternities sometimes by reducing poor widows and orphans, who should have inherited these donations, to the extremest distress and misery. What can be meaner than the practices of their begging Friars, who, as Dr. *Middleton* observes, “ are always about the streets, “ and never fail to carry home a good sack full of provisions for “ the use of their convent.” *Letter from Rome*, 8vo, 1741, p. 220. This trade is copied, as the Doctor remarks, from their predecessors the Priests of Paganism. But, as the same writer informs us, “ *Cicero*, in his book of Laws, restrains this “ practice of begging or gathering alms to one particular order “ of Priests [of *Cybele*], and that only on certain days; because, “ as he says, it propagates superstition, and impoverishes families. Which, by the way, may let us see the policy [and I add, therein the *superlative meanness*] of the church of *Rome*, “ in the great care they have taken to multiply their begging “ orders.” The meanness of Popery is indeed the principal idea which this *Letter from Rome* exhibits, from the beginning to the end. It is impossible for a reader of it to consider the *Roman* clergy in any higher character than that of *Jugglers* shewing their tricks for money, with this infamous difference on the part of the Priests, that, under the mask of religion, they would make all their impostures pass for realities, and thereby incur the guilt of numerous and substantial evils introduced into so-

are

are to consider that the errors of other sects are very differently founded. They do not, like the

ciety, of which the honefter, and oftentimes the more dextrous, *Charlatan* stands acquitted. It is very certain that many of the more liberal and generous of that communion have been scandalized at some of these contemptible practices, and have occasionally expressed their disgust: but still it seems it is thought necessary to continue them, upon the pitiful pretence, that, without such circumstances, religion would make very slender impressions on the minds of the people; which indeed is likely enough to be true, considering with what industry the poor people are kept in ignorance, that religious impressions may not be made upon them by any better means. But the truth is, these impositions are far more necessary for the priests themselves. The management of them is the *craft by which they have their wealth*; and to preserve that, nothing so mean, or childish, or ridiculous, or knavish, which may not be attempted. Dr. Middleton observes, that Father *Mabillon*, a learned *Frenchman*, and a Priest, had never seen the ceremony of sprinkling beasts of labour with holy water upon a certain annual festival, “when all the inhabitants of the city [*Rome*] and neighbourhood send up their horses, asses, &c. to the convent of *St. Anthony* — where a priest in a surplice, at the church-door, sprinkles with his brush all the animals singly, as they are presented to him, and receives from each owner a gratuity proportionable to his zeal and abilities.” — *Mabillon* was surprized at this ceremony, as well as many other parts of their worship, which he had never seen, till he travelled into *Italy*. — “But,” says the Doctor, “if these men of learning and teachers of religion know so little of what is done at *Rome*, how easy must it be to impose upon the poor Catholics of *England*, and keep them in the dark, as to the more exceptionable parts of their worship, which are openly avowed and practised abroad, to the scandal of all the candid and moderate of their own communion.” *Letter*, p. 141, and *Pref. Discourse*, p. xvi. Nothing surely can be more base and unmanly than to keep our fellow-creatures

Papists, appeal to an infallible Judge, but to the scriptures considered as a rule of religion to Protestants in general; and every one having the liberty of searching and studying these, the questions among Protestant churches must be determined by these sacred records, or not at all. And it may happen that they who differ from our establishment may, in some points, and those of no little consequence, have as good or better autho-

in ignorance, that we may with the more facility make a sordid gain of them. It is the *meanness* of a common cheat, and for which an ordinary tradesman would lose his reputation, and a practice, which, in a pretended teacher of religion, deserves a worse punishment than the pillory. But it must be owned that the Lay-papists of *England* are not much less *mean* than the Priests themselves, in submitting to be choused by such conjuring work, especially in a country where they may make a fair examination, without standing in awe of the thunder of the Vatican, or the familiars of an Holy Office. The indignities to which some of our Roman Catholics, not of the lowest rank, are often obliged to submit, in deference to an insolent imperious Priest, cannot with all their caution be so concealed, but that they will occasionally transpire. And what wonder? "In
 " the papers of *Sheldon*, Superior of the Jesuits, seized in *November* 1745, are proofs of commands being obeyed, when
 " gentlemen of the first rank and their chaplains have been both
 " averse to a separation. None are allowed to chuse their own
 " own priests, nor to retain them any longer than is agreeable to
 " the pleasure of the Superior." What meanness in a free-born *Englishman*! See a remarkable instance of the tyranny exercised by the superior ecclesiastics over the inferior Popish clergy, in a very interesting *Address* to their Graces the Archbishops of *Canterbury* and *York*, &c. just published, printed for *Becket* and *De Hondt*, p. 12, 13.

city of the scriptural kind than ourselves. This, as members of a Protestant church, we must allow to be possible, unless we will say at once that we are infallible, and have the same authority to dictate to all Dissenters that Popery pretends to.

But as, without a pretence to such unwarrantable authority, the differences among Protestant societies must still subsist, here is not only room, but an absolute necessity for that mutual forbearance which Popery will not admit of. There are indeed circumstances in Popish worship, which exclude us from any Christian *Fellowship* with those who practise it. The scriptures prohibit all religious intercourse with idolaters; and indeed, considering the prophetic warnings to *come out* from those who are infected with this *abomination*, which are applied by the Apostle *Paul* to the state of the first Christian societies, no man can be too cautious, that he do not forfeit the precious promises given to those who keep themselves undefiled with it.

No objections of this nature lye against any of our Protestant Dissenters. All that they desire is to abound in their own sense of scripture, as we do in ours. This, upon original Protestant principles, cannot be denied them; and upon this bottom, their dissenting from us either in doctrine or worship, founded as their pretensions to it are, and their sincerity in examining for themselves (a matter out of the reach of human judgment) being

ing presupposed, is no more to be found fault with, than our dissenting from them.

For the rest, it is perhaps as much owing to political contingencies as to any thing else, that our system was, and theirs was not, established by civil authorityⁿ; and neither the course of the world, nor the principles of its inhabitants, seem to be in so settled a condition, as absolutely to exclude the possibility of material alterations in the present state both of our public policy and public religion. Popery is more than supposed to have gained ground upon us considerably within the last twenty years. If a farther increase of this wretched superstition should ever bring on another crisis of the Protestant religion, Protestants of all denominations must unite in the defence of their common interest, when it may be found necessary to bolt the door more firmly against the Bishop of *Rome* and all his detestable enormities, to make more room in our ecclesiastical establishment for all the well-wishers to civil and religious liberty, by removing all those circumstances in our

ⁿ In the Convocation of 1562, the abrogation of all Holidays, except *Sunday*, and of the Cross in Baptism; dispensations with respect to the Surplice, and kneeling at the Communion, the total disuse of Organs, were solicited with zeal and freedom; and the question concerning these ceremonies was carried in their favour only by one vote, and that the vote of a proxy. Whereas there was on the other side a majority of *eight*, of those who were present, and heard the debate. *Burnet, Hist. Reform.* vol. III, p. 303.

worship and discipline, which may seem, though but in appearance, to give countenance to the rites and impositions of Popery, sanctified by nothing but a groundless church-authority.

In the mean time, it is an obligation equally incumbent upon the members of the church of *England* and the Protestant Dissenters from it, to be vigilant against the common adversary, and consequently to unite in the strictest bonds of friendship and benevolence. Our Christian liberty on both sides depends on supporting our gracious King and his free and equal government, against all attempts, whether directed against his person, or the civil and religious rights and privileges of the people under his protection. In this light all Protestants are doubly brethren, the sons of one common Father, and the happy subjects of one common Sovereign. Popery is equally an enemy to all Protestant establishments, as well as to all Protestant sects; and in our system has never found a surer game to play, than that of exasperating Protestants of one persuasion against those of another. Hitherto, by the good providence of God, this policy hath miscarried. The Papists are evidently beginning the same game again^o. It is our wisdom, and will be our safety,

^o This is evident from their late printed pleas for Toleration, wherein they affect to set the principles of the Protestant Dissenters, and particularly their enmity to the church of *England*, in the most invidious light; building thereon a claim of nearer

to be aware of them in time, and to cultivate such a measure of good-will and confidence among all Protestants, that none of that denomination, however distinguished, may have reason to complain of being driven into the snare by our untractable disaffection and distrust of them, when it has been and still is so very evident that they cannot deserve it.

To conclude: We seem, in matters of religion, to be arrived at a very interesting crisis, wherein the prophecy of our blessed Saviour, namely, that, *because of the abounding of iniquity, the love of many should wax cold*, is fulfilled among us, as visibly at least as it has been among Christians of any other period since the prophecy was delivered. There seems to be at this time not only a general coolness towards the Protestant religion, as distinguished from the spirit and practices of Popery, but likewise a general inattention to those interests of the temporal as well as of the spiritual kind, which it was the glory and praise of our ancestors to support.

Unhappily for the public, as well as individuals, the fashion of the times prevails too often *kindred* to our ecclesiastical constitution, and a reason *a fortiori* for greater indulgence from it. And in this they may perhaps appear to some people to have succeeded, by the many virulent things which have appeared of late in the public prints against the Dissenters; but written undoubtedly by the Papists themselves, under the mask of *Churchmen*.

in

in religion, as well as in matters of less importance. The word of God, for which the poor people hungred and thirsted in the beginning of the Reformation, now that it is set open to every one with the greatest freedom, seems, in too many instances, to be despised and neglected, like other things, which lose their value, when they lose their novelty. Many seem now even to pride themselves in their ignorance, and to think themselves happy in being able to excuse their ungodly, fraudulent, or immoral practices, on the pretence of wanting learning, or what they call scholarship; unmindful that he who is wilfully ignorant of his Lord's will, when he may have the opportunity of learning it, will be beaten with as many stripes, as he who knows it, and doth it not; and that the few stripes mentioned in the parable are allotted to those only, from whom their Master's will is concealed by some unavoidable obstruction or incapacity ^P.

^P That I may not be suspected of a want of candor, it may be proper to mention the appearance of a more edifying spirit among certain societies which have risen up among us in these latter times. It is said, and I hope with great truth, that numbers of the common people have been so far converted by those who labour in forming these societies, as to put on a more serious and pious deportment, and to abstain from many open instances of licentiousness, for which they were notorious in times past. With respect to the doctrines taught in these societies, it is no small recommendation of them that they are pretended to be the genuine doctrines of the first Reformers of the

On

On another hand, it has been observed, that a selfish spirit prevails too much in those concerns wherein our very constitution is at stake. “ The
 “ public, say some people, is the last thing that
 “ is cared for, even by those classes of men, who,
 “ both by their station and abilities, are under
 “ the highest obligations to consult its welfare,
 “ without which individuals can have no security

church of *England*; the principal of which however is, that the scriptures are the only authoritative rule of faith and practice to the Christian man. How far they have justified these pretensions in their teachings and conduct, it is at present out of my way to inquire. It is natural for the members of an established church to be alarmed on the rise of any new sect, to remark and censure its deviations from the common forms, and to shew and reprehend the ill effects of its peculiarities. Accordingly the Methodists have been blamed for a want of charity towards those of a different persuasion from themselves; for consigning particular persons to condemnation; for being extremely peremptory and dogmatical in their interpretations of scripture; for making pretensions to spiritual illuminations, of which they can give no sufficient proof. It is indeed to be apprehended that they may have given but too just occasion for these censures, and that through a common failing incident to all who pay more attention to artificial systems of theology, than to the genuine sense of scripture. But be their errors what they will, their industry in attending their disciples, the impressions of piety they have made upon them, and the zeal they express for the salvation of souls, are circumstances worthy of our regard and imitation; and are a loud call upon us of the established church, to take heed to ourselves and to our doctrine, to double our diligence in raising a better spirit among our people, and to awaken both them and ourselves from the slumber of secularity, which is so manifestly obstructive of Christian edification.

“ for

“for their peace, their property, or even their
“very existence.”

This state of the case must turn the eyes and expectations of those who perceive the approaching effects of this indifference upon the clergy, of course. *Their* conduct will be marked by the judicious few, though the secular and slothful among them may be indulged and even applauded for conforming to the fashion of the times, by those who, shunning the light of the Gospel themselves, neither understand their own duty nor that of their teachers; and who, desiring to be indulged in their turn, are ready enough to screen themselves under examples, who, they will say, would certainly direct them to a better practice, if a better practice was necessary.

But let no man deceive himself with vain words. In any general calamity, such as a return of Popery would bring upon us, even these thoughtless men must suffer as well as others, either by submitting to a remorseless ecclesiastical tyranny, or by a merciless vengeance for opposing it, and will then be sufficiently awake to see clearly from whence their sufferings are derived; and would be the first to reproach those who have flattered them in their slumbers, and complied with them in those follies and dissipations, which now keep them secure and insensible of the common danger. It will be our happiness and
our

our comfort in such an evil day, to have the testimony of our consciences that we have not ceased to warn every one, within our respective departments, of the just judgments of God upon those who either neglect the care of their salvation in the world to come, or undervalue the means of working it out to the greatest advantage, which have been so bountifully afforded and so repeatedly preserved and rescued from the destructive jaws of Popish tyranny and arbitrary power, by the vigilance of a gracious Providence, over this particular country, perhaps without example in any other.

APPEN-

A P P E N D I X.

N U M B E R I.

An Account of a Popish Book, intituled, The Devotion to the sacred Heart of JESUS, &c. lately published, and dispersed with great Industry among the Roman Catholics of this Country.

THEY who have pleaded for a free Toleration of the Papists in *Great Britain*, on the pretence of their disposition to submit to the present government, and their disclaiming the power of the Pope or church of *Rome* over the temporalities even of Protestant Princes^a, have been obliged

^a See a Letter in the *Public Ledger* of August 28, 1767, signed *A Lover of all Mankind*, and another in the *Gazetteer*, August 29, 1767, signed *Anti-Draco*.

to answer to a very material objection, namely, that while the superstition, enthusiasm, and fanaticism of their people, with respect to visions, revelations, &c. of their pretended saints, arise to such a pitch of extravagance, there can be no depending upon any principles they may espouse, upon the foundation of reason, or even of scripture. For the pretence of an immediate revelation from one of their saints, commanding the most absurd and wicked thing imaginable, must at once cancel all general obligations arising from the tenor either of human or divine laws, as hath been oftentimes proved by various instances, particularly among the devotees of the Jesuits; and as a large majority of their stationed priests in *England* are of that order, the government will have every thing to fear from the impressions those Fathers make upon their people by impositions of that kind.

In answer to this we are told, “ that the Papists
 “ are not so superstitious and bigoted with respect
 “ to the forms of devotion to their reputed saints
 “ as heretofore; that the imposture of pretended
 “ visions and revelations have been detected and
 “ disgraced more lately among themselves;” and we have seen above, that great stress is laid upon the modern Papists not being so much under the influence of their priests as in former times.

What reformation the Papists may have made in their politics, we shall never be able to learn,
 5 but

but from some public and explicit renunciation of their former principles; that no modification of their ancient fanaticism hath as yet taken place among them, will appear by the specimens of it in the performance upon which I am about to remark, which, being calculated for the edification of *English* and *Irish* Papists, may possibly furnish us with a reason, why our predecessors were so strict in prohibiting the importation of Popish books; upon a conviction, no doubt, that they, who could give into such abject superstition with the zeal and enthusiasm that is here prescribed, might easily be wrought up into any attempts upon the religion and government of a race of Heretics, who are taught to hold these solemnities in contempt and derision. The title of this curious publication is as follows:

The Devotion to the Sacred Heart of JESUS; with other pious Practices, devout Prayers, and Instructions, for the use and convenience of Christians in general. With Permission of Superiors. BRUGES, by Joseph Van Praet. 1765.

Opposite to this title-page is a shocking print, representing JESUS CHRIST, with the Breast cut open, and the Heart laid bare, surrounded with what is called a Glory; and this appears, by what follows in the book, to be the very image to which they who practise this *Devotion* pay their adoration.

The book begins with the following account :

“ SECT. I. *Concerning the Institution of the*
“ *Devotion.*

“ The Devotion to the sacred Heart of JESUS,
“ the Feast whereof is kept on the *Friday* follow-
“ ing the Octave of the blessed Sacrament, has
“ been promoted and authorized by several
“ Popes, of whom some have granted a plenary
“ indulgence to such as shall visit the churches
“ of the religious of the Visitation of our blessed
“ Lady on the said Feast,” &c.

It will be proper to inform the Protestant reader, that the orders of Monks and Nuns in Popish countries, being very numerous, and every one zealous for the honour of his or her particular institution, there naturally arises a rivalry among them, which of them shall have the greatest number of Lay-votaries attached to their Order. For which purpose they attempt to institute some peculiar solemnity or devotion, of which some Saint of their own Order, or some particular transaction or incident of the Saint's life or history, is the foundation.

But it is to be observed, that these particular Devotions, to make them authentic, must have the approbation of the Pope ; who, if he can be prevailed with to give it, annexes certain privileges or indulgences to the practice of such Devotions, which are understood to be communicated

to those who practise them according to the form prescribed.

But, forasmuch as these Devotions are apt to occasion strifes and variances between different religious communities, the Popes have frequently refused to authorise such of them as might seem to interfere with the interest or reputation of some other Order or Orders, the Principals of which have often interposed, and remonstrated against the establishment of such new devotions as they apprehended might lessen the credit or importance of their own fraternity.

Accordingly we see here, that this Devotion of the Sacred Heart hath only been authorised by *several* Popes, and that only *some* of those *several* have granted a *plenary* indulgence in favour of it. And we shall see presently, that even this *precious Devotion* was under a cloud at *Rome* from *July* 30, 1729, to *February* 6, 1765. But to proceed with the Introduction.

“ Though this Solemnity may appear *new*, yet
 “ the Devotion is far from being so, and has ever
 “ been the constant practice of many most emi-
 “ nent Saints of the church of God, *St. Bernard*,
 “ *St. Clare*, *St. Catharine of Sienna*, *St. Elzear*,
 “ *St. Francis of Assisum*, *St. Bonaventure*.”

After which he exhibits several fanatical expressions of these pretended Saints; such as, *drawing from this Devotion the most alluring sweet-*

ness and Consolation. — Being all on fire with the love of JESUS, as often as she thought of this adorable Heart. — Would you know where your Elzear is? Seek me in the Heart of JESUS; there I make my usual abode.

But, as the design of this publication is to do particular honour to the Jesuits, the catalogue of Saints devoted to the *Heart* is closed with four of that fraternity; namely, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Francis Xavierius, St. Philip Neri, St. Aloysius Gonzaga. Canonizations of Jesuits have not been frequent; and I question whether, at the time this book was published, there were more than these four Saints of that Order in the Roman Calendar ^b. But they are enough for the purpose of amusing the silly Catholics of *England* and *Ireland*, who, conceiving that the beatification of these Fathers must imply the sanctity of the whole Order, would be the more scandalized at the expulsion of the Jesuits from *France* and *Portugal*; a point to which these crafty politicians were to be very attentive at this crisis,

^b However, to balance the disgrace of the Jesuits in other quarters, his Holiness, it seems, is in the humour to gratify them with one additional Saint at least, as appears by the following Extract of a Letter from *Rome*, published in the *Public Ledger*, April 1, 1767. “ While several States of *Europe* are
“ expelling and insulting the Jesuits, this City is canonizing
“ them. On *Monday* next, another Saint will be added to the
“ Golden Legend, viz. Father *Francis de Jerome*, who has per-
“ formed several surprizing miracles, as well since as before his
“ death.” The letter from *Rome* is dated *March 7*.

“ Who-

“Whoever,” says this compiler, “reads the
“lives of these Saints, must necessarily observe
“the tender Devotion they had to the *Sacred*
“*Heart of Jesus.*”

Had I been of council with this author, I could
have helped him to another Saint, to add to this
venerable groupe; even the pious St. *John*
Baptist Girard, who (as his Process sets forth),
“in order to conceal his sacrilegious and incestu-
“ous flame, said to Miss *Cadiere*, Let us love one
“another dearly, *in the Sacred Heart of Jesus.*
“And hence it comes, says *Cadiere’s* Apologist,
“that all those Love-letters in the Appendix to
“the Proceedings, conclude with these words, *I*
“*am intimately united with you, in the SACRED*
“*HEART OF JESUS.*”

But to proceed with the account before us.
“Jesus Christ,” says this abominable book, “who

^c *John Baptist Girard*, a Jesuit, Rector of the Royal Seminary
of Chaplains of the Navy at *Toulon*, was tried by the Parliament
of *Provence*, in the year 1731, for spiritual incest with his Peni-
tent *Mary Catharine Cadiere*, the consequence of which being
the pregnancy of the said *Cadiere*, he was further charged with
giving her drugs to procure an abortion. The facts were clearly
and punctually proved by sufficient evidence. *Twelve* of his
twenty-four judges would have condemned him to be burned alive;
three voted for the galleys, or perpetual banishment, and *nine* for
his acquittal. The interest, or perhaps the purse, of the Jesuits
prevailed in favour of this last verdict; and thus this profligate
priest escaped, not by the equitable sentence of the law, but by
the corrupt interposition of his own fraternity, who, for their
own honour, should have been the first to bring him to justice.

“ had formerly, by his inspiration, invited only
 “ some particular saints to this amiable devo-
 “ tion to his Sacred Heart, reserved the mani-
 “ festation of it to these latter times, as he re-
 “ vealed to *St. Gertrude*, that it might be a
 “ means to draw the faithful out of that extreme
 “ tepidity, into which he foresaw they would
 “ degenerate.”

What a representation of the blessed Saviour of the world! He foresees the extreme tepidity into which the faithful would degenerate; he knows the means to draw them out of it; and yet withholds this precious remedy for seventeen hundred years from all the world except a few of his favourites, and communicates his intention of manifesting it in these latter ages only to a silly obscure woman, without any view that appears, of its going farther, till it broke out in the manner following.

“ Sister *Mary Margaret*, a religious of the visi-
 “ tation of our blessed Lady, in the monastery of
 “ *Paroi*, a town in the Dutchy of *Burgundy*, who
 “ died the 17th of *October* 1690, in the order
 “ of sanctity, in the 42d year of her age, was
 “ the person whom the Saviour of the world
 “ chose to make known to the faithful his *designs*
 “ concerning the *Devotion of the Heart*. This
 “ holy soul, whom God had replenished with
 “ many singular graces, and who, in an eminent
 “ manner, corresponded with them, being one
 “ day

“ day within the octave of *Corpus Christi*, before
 “ the blessed sacrament, and more affected than
 “ ordinary with the contemplation of God, had
 “ a most earnest desire to make a suitable return
 “ for his dear love towards us. Whereupon the
 “ Son of God told her, she could not testify her
 “ gratitude in a more acceptable manner than in
 “ doing what he had so often required, and then
 “ disclosing his Sacred Heart to her, said,

“ See here the Heart which has so tenderly
 “ loved mankind, and spared nothing even to the
 “ wasting and consuming itself, in testimony of
 “ its love, and yet in return I generally meet
 “ with nothing but ingratitude, contempt, sacri-
 “ leges, irreverences, and coldness, even in the
 “ very sacrament of my love; and still what more
 “ sensibly affects me, is, that great part of these
 “ indignities are sent back from those hearts
 “ which are consecrated to me. Wherefore I
 “ demand of you, in order to procure my glory,
 “ that the first *Friday* after the octave of the
 “ blessed sacrament, be appointed a particular
 “ and solemn festival, on which, by some agree-
 “ able return, my Heart may be honoured, and
 “ the indignities offered to it, whilst it has been
 “ so often exposed on the altars in the holy sa-
 “ crament, be repaired. I promise it will more
 “ abundantly dilate its love on all such as shall
 “ interest themselves in this reparation of ho-
 “ nour.”

This

This impudent, blasphemous lie, was, it seems, too monstrous to gain credit sufficient to procure its authentication from the Holy See. And therefore the writer of the book, foreseeing that his authority for this incredible narrative might be called for, was necessitated to make the following excuse for his hardiness, in a marginal note.

“As the church does not pronounce on the
 “authenticity of this revelation, or the sanctity
 “of the person to whom it was made, in order
 “to conform, as I ought, to the wise regulations
 “of the Holy See, I only relate this as an *Histo-*
 “*rical Fact*, yet so certain and averred, as to
 “challenge deservedly our belief and adherence.
 “We speak as formerly the faithful spoke of the
 “revelation of St. *Juliana*, which gave rise to the
 “solemnity of the feast of *Corpus Christi*.”

Behold the artifice of the Jesuit! *The Church*, saith he, *doth not pronounce on the authenticity*, &c. How so? Why, perhaps, the church hath not been apprised of the revelation, or hath not been applied to, to authenticate it. And yet the hint of the *wise regulations of the Holy See*, leave little room to doubt but that application had been made to it both to authenticate the revelation, and to canonize Sister *Mary Margaret*. The truth is, the politic *Romans* are, for some time by-past, grown cautious how they give credit and sanction to such bare-faced impostures; besides, it appears in the progress of the narrative, that

that the establishment of this devotion had been actually opposed at *Rome*, most probably on account of its being patronized by, and calculated to raise the reputation and promote the interests of, the Jesuits. In the mean time, whilst the revelation remains in the naked condition of an *Historical Fact*, the transmarine Catholics know they may believe as much or as little of it as they please; and accordingly this devotion hath never been in any great repute in *France*, though the lie was forged there, and has, no doubt, been in still less, since the infamous use made of it by the Jesuit *Girard* abovementioned. It has now crossed the sea to *England*, where the forgers of it know very well, there are plenty of poor Catholics, ready to swallow whatever their priests prepare for them, how difficult soever of digestion to the stomachs of their brethren abroad.

But the most diverting circumstance in this apologetical note, is the parallel the author draws between Sister *Mary's* revelation and that of St. *Juliana*, a part of whose history will not be unedifying to those who desire to understand what progress our Roman Catholic countrymen have made in ridding their system of the legendary trash espoused by their forefathers.

“ This saint, or as she is likewise called Mo-
 “ ther *Juliana*, lived in an hospital hard by the
 “ town of *Liege*, and had many extasies and
 “ raptures, and so prophetic a spirit, as to
 “ discern

“ discern the thoughts and intentions of her
 “ neighbours hearts ; she wrestled with devils,
 “ discoursed with the apostles, and wrought many
 “ miracles. But one thing peculiar to her was,
 “ that in her prayers she almost always saw the
 “ moon in her brightness, but with a snip taken
 “ off from her roundness, at which she was much
 “ troubled, but by no means could get out of her
 “ fancy. At last God was pleased to reveal it to
 “ her, that the moon signified the present church,
 “ and the fraction the want of one solemnity
 “ more to be observed in it. Upon which she
 “ received a command from heaven, to proclaim
 “ the observation of this solemnity. For twenty
 “ years she prayed to God to excuse her, and to
 “ make choice of a more worthy person ; but
 “ none being found, she communicates it to Jo-
 “ hannes de Lausenna, and he to Jacobus de Tricis,
 “ then Archdeacon of *Leige*, and afterwards Pope
 “ *Urban IV.* But although the persons to whom
 “ it was communicated highly approved it, yet
 “ she was not satisfied till one of her gossips,
 “ named *Isabella*, after a whole year’s praying for
 “ it, had the same thing revealed to her, with
 “ that circumstance, that this feast had always
 “ been among the secrets of the B. Trinity, but
 “ now the time was come when it should be
 “ published to the world ; and she, in one of her
 “ extasies, saw very distinctly, all the heavenly
 “ orders upon their faces, supplicating God, that,
 “ to

“ to confirm the faith of Christians, this day
 “ might be speedily observed. This *Isabella* was
 “ so much intoxicated by this vision, saith the
 “ Author, that out of the abundance of her spi-
 “ ritual drunkenness (they are his own words)
 “ she declared she would promote the observing
 “ this feast although the whole world should op-
 “ pose her. Which we may well think *Juliana*
 “ rejoiced to hear, and henceforwards they joined
 “ counsels to advance this solemnity. *Juliana*
 “ gets an ignorant young priest to draw up an
 “ office for it, and while he wrote, she prayed,
 “ by which means the office was so well composed,
 “ that it would melt, saith he, the hardest hearts
 “ into devotion; and when it was seen by divines,
 “ they said it was not written by man, but in-
 “ spired by God himself. And yet when Pope
 “ *Urban* published his bull upon the credit of
 “ these revelations, for the celebration of this
 “ feast, he appointed *Thomas Aquinas* to compose
 “ an office for it, and rejected that divine office
 “ of *Juliana* ^b.”

Behold the honourable origin of the feast of
Corpus Christi, one of the most venerable solemnities
 in the Church of *Rome*. A Tale which is
 appealed to by the craftsman under consideration,
 by way of keeping his revelation of the *Sacred*

^d *Stillingfleet's* Discourse of the Idolatry of the Church of
Rome, octavo, 1671, p. 255, 256. who quotes three Popish
 authors for it.

Heart in countenance; as who should say, if Sister *Mary Margaret* told a lie, Mother *Juliana* and her gossip *Isabel* told a bigger. And if they had the address to get a feast founded on their fable, why shall not we pretend to have a devotion established for ours? To what a pitiable ignorance must those poor creatures be reduced who can suffer themselves to be deluded by such gross absurdities? We now go on with Sister *Mary Margaret*.

“ This pious soul, being all in confusion, would
 “ fain have excused herself on account of her
 “ unworthiness, but was soon made sensible, that
 “ Providence, to the end no one should seem im-
 “ portant in his own eyes, makes use of the most
 “ feeble instruments for the bringing about its
 “ greatest designs. At the same time she was
 “ inspired to communicate the affair to Father
 “ *Claud la Colombiere*, of the society of *Jesus*, who
 “ died on the 15th of *February*, 1682, and whose
 “ eminent sanctity and excellent writings still
 “ preserve his memory fresh in the minds of the
 “ faithful.”

Here the cat peeps out of the bag. A *Jesuit* is pitched upon as the proper person to *manifest* this devotion to the world, and pitched upon by inspiration too; a very seasonable lift to the society, which was now sinking in its estimation all over *Europe*. The *French* *Jesuits* in particular had no resource but among the poor dupes of
Great

Great Britain and Ireland, and with these, this was a sure bait to preserve their credit, more particularly considering the station and character of this Father *Claud*, of which our author gives this account.

“ The holy man, full of the spirit of God,
 “ not content in hearing from the mouth of the
 “ religious all that passed as abovementioned,
 “ obliged her moreover to deliver the same in
 “ writing. This done, and reflecting on the ele-
 “ vated virtue of the person, *on one side, and on*
 “ *the other*, considering the excellence of the de-
 “ votion so proper for kindling the fire of divine
 “ love, he judged the whole was from God, and
 “ accordingly received it as a devotion inspired
 “ by the Holy Ghost, delivering down to poste-
 “ rity the singular lights, heaven had inspired
 “ him with on this subject in a spiritual retreat
 “ he made at *London* in the year 1677.”

So then this precious devotion was licked into form at *London*, a very singular recommendation of it, no doubt, to the *English* Catholics. The man would have clinched it more effectually had he given the revelation to an *English* devotee. But this it should seem was impossible. The female Catholics of *England*, we are to suppose, have *elevated virtue* only *on one side*, and that would not have gone cleverly down with *French* pietists. But the devotion being conceived in *Burgundy*, and born in *London*, both nations may claim

claim kindred with it, and so join amicably in the propagation of it ; and so it turns out. For,

“ The peculiar graces he (Father *Claud*) received on this occasion, and the repeated instances the said holy religious woman had from our blessed Saviour for advancing this work, effectually convinced him of the will of God, in this design : in consequence, he applied his utmost endeavours towards establishing this devotion in *France* and also in *England*, during the time he continued there in quality of preacher to the then Dutchess of *York*, afterwards Queen of *England*. In effect, this devotion began to spread, *in spite of all opposition*, and in less than a year, *France* beheld it happily established. The faithful were pleased in seeing pictures of the Sacred Heart drawn and dispersed ; prints cut and engraved, chapels erected, and altars consecrated to its honour, with the general approbation of all.”

Matters clear up upon us apace. We now learn what business this Jesuit *La Colombiere* had in *England*, namely, to assist the Duke of *York* in the pious project of converting this heretical kingdom. We learn, moreover, that this devotion met with a spiteful opposition in *France* : but at length, it seems, after a struggle for a year or so, it procured an establishment in that country, by drawing pictures, striking prints of the Sacred Heart, erecting chapels, and consecrating altars
to

to its honour, may be so called, which is very much to be doubted. The Catholics of *Britain*, I am told, are a little squeamish on these occasions, particularly such of them as do not partake of the merits of the jesuitical order. They chuse to see the ring of the fisherman to *establishments*; and the *general approbation of all in France*, even if that were true, does not imply the *general approbation of all in Rome*. Not to mention that the devotion of the *Sacred Heart* may be said to be thus far established in this protestant country by the dispersion of this foolish book. For the *English* Catholics have their pictures, prints, chapels and altars as well as the *French*.

The prefacing Jesuit, aware of this scruple, endeavours to stop the gap, by saying, that
 “ The devotion to the Sacred Heart, in spite of
 “ all the efforts of our infernal enemy, and dis-
 “ solute corruptions of the world, has gained an
 “ ascendancy throughout the whole church. —
 “ The same is publicly practised in every Catholic
 “ country of the universe, and even at *Rome*
 “ itself, under the eyes of the vicar of Jesus
 “ Christ.”

Very possibly; for the said vicar, we are informed, hath got a scurvy custom of winking, and sleeping a dog's sleep, when he does not chuse to see every thing under his eyes.

But though the devotion of the *Sacred Heart* could get no passport from *Rome*, it obtained, we are told, another from heaven, which should in

all reason, have been as satisfactory to the devotees, as one from *Rome*. For this we have the word of no less a man than *Joseph Languet* Bishop of *Soissons*, afterwards promoted to be Archbishop of *Sens*, who took the pains to write the life of Sister *Mary Margaret* at large. * According to this Biographer, “our blessed Redeemer spoke to her as follows.

“I am much pleased in the devotion the faithful shew for my Heart, and for this reason I desire the picture thereof may be drawn and exposed, that, by this so amiable a representation, the hearts of men may be softened into repentance. I promise that such as in a more particular manner shall honour this picture, shall partake more amply of those graces with which my Heart is replenished.” See p. 46.

Here we have the blessed Redeemer of the world represented as injoining an act of downright idolatry: for such does the *honour* paid to this picture plainly turn out, as appears by the following direction for an association in honour of the Sacred Heart. N° VIII. p. 46.

“Every associate should have in his house or chamber a picture of the Sacred Heart. The

* In *L'Etat de la France*, published 1718, vol. III. p. 166. This R. R. prelate, is called JEAN-JOSEPH LANGUET de la Villeneuve de Gergy, Abbé de Coëtmalcen, Docteur en Théologie, de la Maison de Navarre.

“advantage

“ advantage among others, is this ; should any
 “ particular be hindered from visiting the *blessed*
 “ *Sacrament*, he may *before this picture* acquit
 “ himself of the obligation he hath voluntarily
 “ taken upon himself. *Jesus Christ* has given us
 “ an instance and proof of how great merit this
 “ practice is in his sight.” *Ibid.* And then fol-
 lows the passage quoted above out of Sister
Mary Margaret’s Life, written by the Bishop of
Soissons.

What honour is paid by the Romanists to what
 they call the *Blessed Sacrament*, or the *Host*, every
 one knows, who hath seen their rituals, or has
 been present at Mass, either at home or abroad.
 But even the Catholics themselves acknowledge,
 that to adore an unconsecrated Host is *Idolatry*,
 since, without such consecration, the miracle of
 transubstantiation is not performed^f. Now what-

^f The following narrative, written in 1682, is an instance in
 point. “ A woman that lives in *Tours*, and was melancholy,
 “ and full of vapours, desired to receive the sacrament every
 “ day, in which, she said, she found most wonderful consola-
 “ tion. The priest has the reputation of a very worthy man,
 “ and being a judicious person, he clearly saw through the
 “ poor woman’s weakness and superstition, and was willing
 “ enough to do what he thought an innocent fraud, and might
 “ give the distempered person some ease, and yet not tend
 “ to a prophanation of holy things ; so, instead of the sacrament,
 “ he gave her unconsecrated wafers, which she received with
 “ her ordinary devotion, and they had the ordinary effects on
 “ her. But as *Frenchmen* are too apt to tell their own secrets, the
 “ curate made himself merry with some of his friends upon

ever honour is paid to the Holy Sacrament at such time of visitation as is mentioned above, is here directed to be paid to the picture of the Sacred Heart; which being unconsecrated, and consequently untransubstantiated, cannot, even upon the principles of Popery, pretend to the honours due to the consecrated Host; and therefore the worship paid to it by this direction, must be idolatrous, since, according to the instance in the margin, the intention of the worshiper cannot excuse the crime, where the object is incompetent §.

“ this occasion, and told how he had deceived the hypochon-
 “ driacal woman. So the thing got wind, and was looked on
 “ as a great impiety in the priest to suffer one to commit such
 “ idolatry to a piece of bread, to which, no doubt, she offered
 “ the same adoration that was due, if it had been consecrated.
 “ So the curate was cited before the archbishop of *Tours*, where
 “ he had met with a severe censure, if the esteem he is justly
 “ in, had not preserved him. — But he was condemned to six
 “ months imprisonment,” &c. *News from France*, p. 14,
 15, in the first volume of Bishop *Burnet's* Tracts in quarto.
 The Bishop was in *France* when this happened, and having told
 the story, he offers the following reflexion upon it to his cor-
 respondent. “ I leave it to you, and your most learned friend
 “ when you meet, to consider, if this is acknowledged to be
 “ idolatry in this melancholy woman, to worship a piece of
 “ bread, which she verily believed was the body of Christ;
 “ then whether it will not certainly follow that the whole
 “ church of *Rome* is guilty of idolatry, if Christ is not corpo-
 “ rally present in the Host, and that their adoring him as
 “ present will not excuse them from idolatry, if he is not
 “ really present.”

§ In the litany to the *Sacred Heart*, p. 27. are the following

At length, however, it seems, the present Pope was prevailed with to give a sanction to this devotion in *Poland*, at the instance of the bishops of that kingdom, the tenor of which, as it is printed in a blank leaf between pages 72 and 73, is as follows :

Decretum Poloniæ.

“Instantibus pro concessione Officii et Missæ SSmi Cordis Jesu plerisque reverendissimis episcopis Regni Poloniæ, nec non Archi-confraternitate urbis sub hoc titulo erecta ; Congregatio sacrorum Rituum habita die 26 Januarii hujus anni probe noscens cultum Cordis Jesu jam hodie esse per omnes fere Catholici Orbis partes, foventibus earum episcopis, propagatum, sæpe etiam a sede apostolica decoratum millenis Indulgentiarum Brevibus, datis ad innumeras propemodum confraternitates, sub titulo Cordis Jesu, canonice erectas ; simulque intelligens hujus Officii et Missæ non aliud agi quam ampliari cultum jam institutum ; et symbolice renovari memoriam illius divini amoris quo unigenitus Dei filius humanam suscepit naturam, et factus obediens usque ad mortem, præbere se dixit exemplum hominibus quod esset

expressions. — *Refuge of Sinners.* — *Fortitude of the Just.* — *Comfort of the afflicted.* — *Main Strength of the tempted.* — *Terror of Devils.* — *Sanctification of Hearts.* — *Perseverance of the Good.* — *Hope of the dying.* — *Joy of the blessed.* — *Delight of all the Saints.* Have mercy on us.

mitis et humilis corde. His de causis, referente eminentissimo et reverendissimo Cardinali Episcopo Sabinensi, audito R. P. D. Cajetano Forti Promotore Fidei, PRÆVIO RECESSU A DECISIS SUB DIE 30 JULII 1729, annuendum precibus censuit Episcoporum Regni Poloniae, et dictae Archi-confraternitatis urbis deliberatum deinceps de Officio et Missa rite approbandis. Quod quidem Congregationis votum per me Secretarium relatum Domino nostro Clementi Papæ XIII. sanctitas sua, hujus etiam Decreti tenore perlecto, in omnibus approbavit. Hac die 6^{to} Februarii, 1765. *Joseph Maria*, Card. *Feroni*, Præfectus. *S. Burghesius*, S. R. C. Secretarius. Loco ✠ Sigilli.”

The compiler of this *Devotion* informs us, that “the above sheets were drawn off, before this “Decree came to his hand.” He does not, however, omit to avail himself of it, as an additional lure to the *British* Catholics, observing, that, “the “approbation of his Holiness, especially on so “solemn an occasion, cannot but be an object of “the greatest importance to the Catholic reader, “who may discover the brightest light reflected “from it on the matter he has treated, and a “remarkable weight added to the motives inducing them to the practice of this holy devotion.”

But why then is not this *Decree* given in *English* as well as the rest of the book? or what light can

can it reflect to a reader who does not understand *Latin*?

Be it known then to the *English* reader, whether Protestant or Catholic, 1. That this Decree authorises this devotion no where but in the kingdom of *Poland*, at a sufficient distance from his Holiness, and the Congregation of *Sacred Rites*, not to scandalize the good Catholics of *Portugal*, *France*, and other countries where the devotions of the Jesuits were in no reputation. The occasion was this: In 1764 the *Polish* Dissidents confederated, “and employed their utmost efforts to be reinstated in their rights, “and the greatest part of the Nuncios had instructions to act in their favour. But,” says my author, “it is universally known by what “an outrageous clamour the clergy not only procured their demands to be rejected, but,” &c.^h Divers circumstances however gave suspicions to the clergy that the Dissidents would not sit down quietly with this repulse; provision was therefore to be made against their future efforts to relieve themselves. On these occasions, where *Heresy* is to be humbled, no coadjutors are equal to the Jesuits. Superstitions, like this of the *Sacred Heart*, work wonders by inflaming the minds of the ignorant populace, and by attaching them to the persons of those who communi-

^h See a pamphlet intitled, *Reflexions on the Affairs of the Dissidents in POLAND*, printed at *London*, 1767, p. 20.

cate such venerable mysteries to them. We learn from the tenor of the Decree itself that the jesuitical arch-confraternity at *Rome* had a principal hand in procuring it. And all these circumstances laid together, shew how seasonably this decree would come in aid of the *Polish* clergy, and what *weighty motives* these considerations would afford to his Holiness, and the Congregation of the *Sacred Rites*, to lay aside their former scruples, and to stretch a point in order to humble the heretical and factious Diffidends.

I call it *stretching a point*, as it is evident from the decree itself, that, on the 30th of *July*, 1729, a decision against the devotion of the *Sacred Heart* had been made by this very Congregation of *Sacred Rites*, and consequently by the authority of the Pope, from which decision it was necessary to RECEDE, before this decree could take place. In the mean time, we are presented with a remarkable contrast, between *the millenary Briefs of Indulgences*, with which this *Devotion of the Sacred Heart* had been often decorated by the *See Apostolic*, and the decision of *July* 1729, against the authenticity of it.

I leave it now to the consideration of the *English* and *Irish* Catholics whether this decree, calculated solely for the meridian of *Poland*, can reflect any new light upon the *Devotion* of the *Sacred Heart* which they are authorised to follow, unless they and their good friends the Je-
suits

suits may have some such *motives*, with respect to these kingdoms, as induced the Pope to gratify the *Polish* clergy with the above-cited decree, and have some design to solicit his Holiness for the like sanction for *this devotion* for *England*.

Nor indeed is this an improbable conjecture, for at page 259, we find the following supplications :

— “ Give thy grace and blessing to all the
“ clergy, and send amongst them that heavenly
“ fire, which thy Son came to cast on earth, and
“ which he so earnestly desired should be en-
“ kindled. Assist and protect all apostolical mis-
“ sionaries,” &c.

That the Jesuits lay claim to be the leaders of all *Apostolical Missionaries* in virtue of their fourth vow, in which they promise *specialem obedientiam summo Pontifici circa missiones*, is well known. It is not therefore without reason, or without sagacity, that a prayer for enkindling the fire upon earth, is followed by a petition for success to those who have the greatest quantity of combustibles in their storehouses, and the best dispositions to enkindle them.

In another place, p. 193, they are directed to pray for *Union among Christian princes*, — *the extirpation of heresy*, — *and exaltation for their holy mother the church*.

From these particulars it appears that though the *Devotion to the Sacred Heart* is the *first* ob-
ject

ject in this publication which takes the attention of the reader, yet that it is far from being the *principal* object. If the manifestation of it were to have been committed to any other hands than those of a Jesuit, I will venture to say, the secret might have remained with Sister *Mary Margaret* to this hour. For that this compilation was put together merely to give the Jesuits consequence with the *English* Papists, appears from the following forms.

Pag. 228. There is what is called a Commemoration of St. *Ignatius* of *Loyola* [Founder of the Jesuits], in these words:

“ *Antiphone*. This man, despising the world,
 “ and triumphing over earthly things, heaped up
 “ Riches in Heaven by word and work. *Versicle*.
 “ The Lord loved and adorned him. *Respons*.
 “ A Garment of Glory he hath put on him.

“ *The Prayer*.

“ O God, who, for the greater Glory of thy
 “ name, hast, by the blessed *Ignatius*, strengthened
 “ the Church militant with NEW AUXILIARIES,
 “ graciously vouchsafe that we by his Assistance
 “ and Imitation, solicitously combating upon earth,
 “ may obtain with him an everlasting crown in
 “ Heaven.”

It is not a little remarkable, that, while the Catholics of other countries are expelling those *new auxiliaries* for their flagitious imitation of
 3 their

their founder St. *Ignatius*ⁱ, the good Catholics of *England* should be praying to obtain an everlasting crown in heaven by virtue of such imitation.

Page 236, we have a Devotion to St. *Aloysius Gonzaga* “for six *Sundays* without intermission, “in memory of the six years he lived in the Society of Jesus.” What his particular merit was, we learn from two of his titles in the Litany appointed as a part of this Devotion; viz. “Particular Client of St. *Ignatius*. — Most zealous “observer of the Rules.” This St. *Aloysius*, it seems, “was canonized by Pope *Benedict XIII*, “and indulgences granted thereupon by *Clement XII*, to encourage the Devotion.”

But the most complete of the jesuitical Devotions here exhibited is the *Novena*, or nine days Devotion, allotted to St. *Francis Xaverius*, commonly called the Apostle of the *Indies*. “This “*Novena*,” we are told, p. 216, “commences on “the fourth of *March*, and continues nine days; “that is, till the twelfth of *March*, on which day, “in the year 1622, Pope *Gregory XV* canonized “St. *Francis Xaverius*.”

A few of the abominable and impious idolatries of this particular Devotion will serve to characterize it.

ⁱ For the true character of *Ignatius Loyola*, see *Le Catechisme des Jesuites*, written by *Stephen Pasquier*, a zealous Roman Catholic, chap. xi, xii, xvii, xviii.

Pag. 223. for the *First Day* this Prayer is directed to be said :

“ Most Glorious St. *Francis Xaverius*, Apostle
 “ of the *Indies*, if it be for the Glory of God,
 “ *and thy Honour*, that I obtain what I desire and
 “ beg by this *Novena*, obtain for me this Grace
 “ of our Lord ; if not, guide my petition, and
 “ beg of our Lord for me, that which is most
 “ proper for his Glory, and the benefit of my
 “ Soul.”

Here we see the *Honour* of a scurvy Monk, and in fact a notorious Impostor ^k, set upon a level with the *Glory* of the most High God. One would wish to know what would be the case, on the supposition that what is desired would be for the Glory of God, and *not* for the Honour of the dead Jesuit? And how the casuistical Doctors of the church would salve this gross impiety, by the application of their ridiculous distinction between *Λαλσεια* and *Δουλεια*?

Page 224, 225. after a direction “ to say
 “ thrice the Lord’s Prayer and three *Hail Marys*,”
 the following prayer is prescribed:

“ Most Holy Father St. *Francis Xaverius*, who
 “ receivest the Praises from the mouths of inno-
 “ cent children, I most humbly implore thy boun-
 “ tiful Charity, for the sake of the most precious
 “ blood of Jesus, and of the immaculate concep-
 “ tion of our Blessed Lady Mother of God, to the

* See *Le Catechisme des Jesuites*, chap. xvii.

“ end

“ end thou mayest obtain of God’s infinite good-
 “ nefs, that at the approach of my last hour my
 “ heart may be separated and withdrawn from all
 “ worldly thoughts and distractions, and be fixed
 “ in the most ardent love of him, and a vehement
 “ desire of an happy eternity, so that laying aside
 “ the multiplicity of earthly things which hitherto
 “ have perplexed me, I may most diligently seek,
 “ and perfectly find, that one thing which is ne-
 “ cessary, which is to die in rest and peace under
 “ the protection of the most Holy Virgin *Mary*,
 “ in the wounds of Jesus her most blessed Son, in
 “ the sweet embraces of my God, *and in thy*
 “ *presence, Holy Saint*, through whose intercession
 “ I hope to obtain this mercy,” &c. &c.

So then it should seem that the protection of
Mary, the wounds of *Jesus*, and the embraces of
 God himself, will be of no avail without the
presence of this *Holy Saint*.

However, it appears that this same Saint is a little
 shy of his favours, and must be kept in good hu-
 mour by various compliments, particularly to his
 order: for at pag. 220, the suppliant is told, that
 “ for the more effectual prevailing with St. *Fran-*
 “ *cis Xaverius*, it will be *convenient* every day, to
 “ make a special commemoration of St. *Ignatius*
 “ *Loyola*, whom St. *Francis Xaverius* honoured,
 “ respected, and loved, as his Father, Master,
 “ and Superior.”

And

And undoubtedly, at the same time that this Commemoration is so *convenient* for the poor idolatrous performers of this *Novena*, it is not *inconvenient* for the pious, simple-minded Fathers, who communicated these precious treasures of Devotion to the Roman Catholics of this country.

Again, after the Prayer above-cited, the Rubric, page 226, directs, “ In the next place, you
“ are to ask of St. *Francis Xaverius* the particular
“ favour you desire to obtain, *heightening, as much*
“ *as in you is, your confidence in him*, with such
“ words as your affectionate thoughts shall suggest,
“ or with such aspirations as your Devotion shall
“ dictate. — Then, *the more to please this Holy*
“ *Apostle*, in imitation of him, say that prayer
“ which he himself composed and used to say
“ every day for the conversion of the Infidels.”

What a deal of coaxing the Soul of this Jesuit takes to be brought into any tolerable temper! If compassion for the poor deluded creatures whose heads and hearts are filled with this impious fanaticism did not check one's mirth, it would be pleasant enough to hear what *words* the *affectionate thoughts* of a young Catholic female who *desired* an husband, or of a younger brother in want of an establishment, and who *desired* to find it in a lucky run in a gambling party, &c. would *suggest* to heighten their *confidence* in St. *Francis Xavier*. His intercession is not in the least confined

fin'd to the *spiritual* desires of the votary; and this scope being given to the performer of the *Novena*, it is not difficult to conceive what ridiculous, and perhaps profane, requests the poorer and more ignorant Papists will put up to this jesuitical Saint. Examples are not wanting of most shocking petitions even in the legends dispersed among the Catholics in these days. However, if the thing requested is but obtained, let the means be what they will, we may be sure it will turn out to the *Honour of the Saint*, how little soever the *Glory of God* is promoted by it.

Page 213. we have the Litany of St. *Francis Xaverius*, in which are the following suffrages: *Destroyer of Idols*. — St. Francis Xaverius, *most worthy Son of Ignatius*. — *Light of Infidels*. — *Martyr in desiring to die for Christ*. — *Confessor in Virtue, and Profession of Life*. — DOCTOR OF GENTILES IN ALL SORTS OF LANGUAGES.

It is an easy kind of Martyrdom to suffer only in *desire*; and with respect to *Xavier's* Confessorship, we see it was only in *Virtue* and *Profession of Life*. For that he was otherwise molested for preaching the Gospel, either in the *Indies* or elsewhere, does not appear from any authentic memorials, nor indeed is pretended in those fictitious ones of *Turfellin* or others, which are full of fabulous accounts of *Xavier's* miracles.

Our compiler however makes us ample amends for this unnatural instance of jesuitical modesty in
the

the last of the titles bestowed upon *Xavier*, namely, *Doctor of Gentiles in all sorts of Languages*. It is a strain of impudence peculiar to the Jesuits to ascribe to a man characters and qualities, which he himself disowns, and disowns with serious lamentations for the want of them.

What sort of a *Doctor of Languages* *Xavier* was among the Indian Gentiles, he hath himself left a full account under his own hand.

“ If,” says he, “ we understood the language
“ of *Japan*, I doubt not but many would become
“ Christians. God grant that we may learn it in
“ a short time, then we shall be able to do some-
“ thing for the Christian cause. Now truly we
“ live among them as so many dumb statues: for
“ they say and debate a great deal concerning us,
“ to which we are silent. Being ignorant of their
“ country language, we are turning children
“ again for the present, that we may learn the
“ first elements of it ¹. ”

If any honest *English* Catholic, after this, has faith to believe that *Xavier* was a *Doctor of the Gentiles in all sorts of Languages* (which, as the

¹ Si nos linguam calleremus Japonicam, non dubito, quin plurimi fierent Christiani. Faxit Deus ut eam brevi addiscamus: tum demum aliquam Christianæ rei navabimus operam, nam nunc quidem inter eos tanquam mutæ statuæ versamur. Multa enim illi de nobis & dicunt & agitant, ad quæ nos obmutescimus. Patrii ipsorum sermonis ignari, in præsentia in linguæ hujus percipiendis elementis repuerascimus. *Xaverii*, Epist. lib. III. epist. v.

Jesuit *Acosta*, who was upon the Indian Mission, affirmed, amounted to above *seven hundred*), he will make no difficulty in believing the miracles that the Jesuit *Bouhours* retails in his Life of *Xavier*, from *Horatius Tursellin*, and others. “Neither Jesus Christ,” says *Pasquier*, “whilst he was upon earth, nor, after his ascension, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, wrought so many miracles, as *Xavier* did in the *Indies* ;” of which he gives a pleasant enumeration, and afterwards observes, “that it costs much less, in such matters, to believe them at home, than to take the trouble to enquire into the truth of them upon the spot where they are said to have been performed.” *Cat. des Jesuites*, u. f. In this kind of forgery, however, the Jesuits are not alone, and they may apply to their own and other fraternities what *Horace* says of Poetical Romancers in general,

—*Hanc veniam petimusque, damusque vicissim*^m.

Shocked and disgusted, as the serious and religious Protestant reader must likewise be, with this view of the abject and paganish superstition of these Devotions, I willingly spare myself the trouble of raking farther at this time into the rest of the trumpery of this detestable book; such as, *The Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Mary*ⁿ — In-

^m See *Reflexions upon the Devotions of the Roman Church*, printed in the year 1674.

ⁿ As an inducement to this Devotion, we are told, “It is not in nature to please the one of the two Hearts, without making

vocation of *one rank* of the Saints — The enumeration of these Ranks — The benefit of repeating *Hail Marys, Pater-nosters, Angelus Domini's*, such a number of times — The manner of obtaining, and the beneficial operation of *Indulgences, &c. &c.* And shall only mention one more particular, as it relates to a point of Popish doctrine, which their controversial writers have occasionally thought fit to disown.

It hath been objected to the Papists, that let a man have been ever so notorious a sinner in the whole course of a long life, provided he does but go through with such and such forms of Devotion upon his death-bed, he may insure the peace of the church, and consequently final salvation to himself. As it is evident what encouragement this must give to the most profligate sinners, the *Romish* Divines have thought fit to deny that this is the doctrine of their church. If it is not, we desire to be informed what edification the poor deluded Catholics of *England* can reap from the

“yourself agreeable to the other, and acceptable to both. Go
 “then, devout Client, go to the Heart of *Jesus*, but let your
 “way be through the Heart of *Mary*. — The Sword of Grief
 “opens you a passage, enter by the wound Love has made,” &c.
 p. 73. In the Litany of this Devotion, “Heart of *Mary* united
 “to that of *Jesus*. — Organ of the Holy Ghost; Sanctuary of
 “the Divinity; Refuge of Sinners; Hope of the Agonizing;
 “Seat of Mercy; Pray for us :” p. 74. 78. — And page 80,
 “Hail *Mary*, Spouse of the Holy Ghost; Temple of the Divi-
 “nity; Beautiful Lily of the most resplendent Trinity.”

following

following *Example*, to be found at the 90th page of this pernicious book.

“ *An Example.*

“ A Nobleman, who, for *sixty* years of his life
 “ past, never had access to the Sacraments, and
 “ who had given loose to the passions of body and
 “ mind, and abandoned himself to the slavery of
 “ his spiritual enemy, fell sick, and was in the
 “ utmost danger of life. Hopes of salvation he
 “ had none ; and so desperate was his case, that
 “ he would not give ear to the salutary advice of
 “ his Director, or admit into his mind the thoughts
 “ of reconciling himself to his Creator, by means
 “ of the Sacrament of Penance. Nevertheless,
 “ in the midst of the excesses of so profligate a
 “ life, he had never entirely lost sight of some
 “ small Devotion and regard to the ever Blessed
 “ Mother of God. Jesus Christ, who manifests
 “ the riches of his mercy, particularly to such,
 “ cast a favourable eye on his soul, and raised
 “ there so great a compunction for his sins, that
 “ entering into himself, and in the utmost contri-
 “ tion of his heart, he three several times in the
 “ same day made a general confession of his whole
 “ life, received the Holy Eucharist, and the *sixth*
 “ day after, died in all peace and quiet of mind,
 “ and with the sentiments of joy which flow from
 “ a *well-grounded* confidence in the mercies and
 “ bounty of our suffering Redeemer and his sa-
 “ cred passion.”

Hitherto the salvation of the penitent is *hypothetical*, depending upon the supposition that the *confidence* above-mentioned was *well-grounded*; concerning which it is possible a superannuated Rake, who should desire to profit by this *example*, might entertain some doubt. It is possible that a member even of the church of *Rome*, might have picked up some obscure notion of the Gospel-doctrine of repentance; and if the bait was laid for a dissolute Protestant, this is still more likely to happen. In either case there would be misgivings, that this *peace and quiet of mind* of the departing sinner might rather be the effect of an ill-grounded confidence in the priest, than of a confidence of another sort. It became necessary therefore to put the salvation of this Nobleman beyond all scruple; and accordingly the fact is clinched as follows, *with a witness*.

“ In effect, our blessed Saviour revealed, soon
 “ after his death, to the holy St. *Bridget*, that the
 “ said penitent died in a state of Grace, was a
 “ blessed soul, and owed his happiness in great
 “ measure to the tender and affectionate compas-
 “ sion which he ever found and nourished in his
 “ heart so often as he heard others speak of the
 “ *sacred Dolours* of our blessed Lady, or happened
 “ to entertain the memory of them in his mind °.”

° These *Dolours*, which are seven in number, have, it seems, a *moveable Feast* assigned for the celebration of them. One would wonder what *Dolours* had to do with a *Feast*, were we not

No

No farther remarks will be necessary upon this particular passage. St. *Bridget's* authority for a revelation of this importance will hardly go down even with a sensible Roman Catholic, who gives himself a moment's time to reflect what disorders a doctrine of this kind, backed with a divine revelation, must bring into civil society. I am willing to believe that there are particular persons among the Papists, who may be convinced that, notwithstanding the decision of the Council of *Constance*, *to break their faith, or to falsify their word*, whether given to Heretics or others, is an immoral action, highly displeasing to God. But what security is this principle to those who deal with them, if *the peace of the church* may so easily be had in such circumstances as those of this Nobleman? If there are particular sorts of sin out of the reach of these *Dolours* of the blessed *Mary*, there are, we are sure, other mental exercises prescribed in Popery, which will do as much for the blackest sinner. We have read of absolutions being given beforehand for sins *intended* to be committed, where the undertakers chose not to risque their salvation on the *merit* of the act, without a farther security from the church. Whatever sentiments an honest and sincere Papist

told that these *seven Dolours* are overbalanced by the *twice seven Joys* of the B. *Mary*. The latter seven of these *Joys* were revealed, it is said, to St. *Thomas Becket*, which must be a singular recommendation to *English Catholics*. See p. 76.

might entertain of the lawfulness of certain actions, considered upon a comparison with the general rules of morality, it may be laid down for certain that not one of them has the least doubt concerning the efficacy of the *Peace of the Church* in securing full and final pardon for sins of the deepest dye. It may be said that the church seldom goes these lengths, but to procure some advantage to the Catholic religion against her enemies. But this, I fear, will only serve to put us in mind, that that the church of *Rome*, having a continual demand for such advantages in an Heretical country, must think it necessary to dispense this *Peace of the Church* with a more liberal hand to such adventurers as may undertake, by whatever means, to promote her interest, and to improve the prospect of subduing the *Northern Heresy*.

Upon the whole, a stronger proof cannot be given than is exhibited in this book, that the fanatic spirit of Popery is *still the same*; or if we may discern some abatement of it in Popish countries, and particularly in those from which the Jesuits have been expelled, we perceive, by this publication, that it is yet in its highest fermentation among the Roman Catholics of this country. The intercourse which the Jesuits have all along had with *English* Papists, give those crafty Fathers a sufficient insight into the *demands* and *occasions* of their *Devotees*, to prevent their recommending to them Forms of Devotion for which they have

no

no fuitable affections. What impreffions are made upon our Roman Catholics by thefe and the like means appears from their burning zeal to convert Heretics, and the care they take to have their children early instructed in the fame fyftem, by putting them under the tuition of thefe fons and fucceffors of *St. Ignatius*. And while this is their tafte and temper, our Catholic countrymen muft excufe us, if we think thefe circumftances equal to a demonftration that they are ftill in the very dregs of the politics, as well as the fuperftition, of the moft obnoxious of their predeceffors.

A P P E N D I X.

N U M B E R II.

*Containing a Letter from Pope Clement XI to
Charles VI, Emperor of Germany, dated June 4,
1712.*

AS it has of late been often denied that the doctrine of the Council of *Constance*, viz, *That Faith is not to be kept with Heretics*, and particularly when the interests of the church come in question, is not the doctrine of the church of *Rome*, it has been thought expedient to subjoin the Decision of a Pope near 300 years after the said Council was held, and that with respect to the most solemn treaties made between sovereign princes.

But, his Holiness having made mention in this Letter of four treaties in which the interests of the church were concerned, namely, the treaties
of

of *Westphalia*, *Ryswick*, *Alt-Ranstadt*, and *Utrecht*, it will be necessary, that we may better understand the Pope's doctrine, to give a short account of each of those treaties, so far as relates to the stipulations in them concerning Religion.

By the Peace of *Westphalia*, negotiated at *Munster* and *Osnaburg* in 1648, it was stipulated, that "Those of the Confession of *Augsburg*, who
" have been in possession of churches, and, among
" others, the burghers and inhabitants of *Oppen-*
" *heim*, shall be maintained in the ecclesiastical
" state of the year 1624; and that others, who
" are desirous of embracing the same exercise of
" the Confession of *Augsburg*, shall be at liberty
" to practise it in public as well as in private,"
&c. ^a

It is to be observed, that the Articles of this Treaty have been considered as "fundamental
" laws and constitutions, which serve as a basis to
" all subsequent treaties ^b."

Nevertheless the Pope then reigning took care
" to publish a Bull, annulling all the articles of
" this Treaty which he conceived prejudicial to
" the Roman Catholic Religion ^c;" and consequently to dispense with the Roman Catholic Powers, who were parties to it, from fulfilling their engagements with the Protestants.

^a Mod. Universal Hist. 8vo, vol. XXX. p. 285.

^b Ibid. 284.

^c Ibid. 291.

About the end of the year 1697 the Peace of *Ryswick* was ratified. “ During the negotiations
 “ at *Ryswick*, the Ambassadors of the Protestant
 “ Princes delivered a memorial to the Mediator,
 “ demanding that in *Strasburg*, and all other cities
 “ of *Alsace* to be ceded to *France*, the *Lutheran*
 “ religion should be tolerated, and enjoy all the
 “ rights and privileges secured by the Treaty of
 “ *Westphalia*. The *French*, desiring some time to
 “ answer, in concert with the Imperial Plenipo-
 “ tentiaries, neglected this representation, and in-
 “ serted in the Treaty, that the Roman Catholic
 “ Religion, in the places to be delivered up, should
 “ remain in the same state it was at that time.
 “ Thus, no notice being taken of the Protestants,
 “ several churches were left to the Papists, which,
 “ according to the Laws of the Empire, and the
 “ Preliminaries of the Treaty, ought to have been
 “ taken from them, and restored to the Protest-
 “ ants. The Ministers of the Electors and other
 “ Protestant Princes refused to sign the Treaty till
 “ this clause was altered, and published a Memo-
 “ rial justifying their refusal, and shewing that
 “ this Article of the Treaty was contrary to the
 “ Laws of the Empire, the peace of religion, and
 “ the Treaty of *Westphalia* ^d.”

“ But, as another Historian observes, what
 “ misunderstanding soever there might be be-

^d Mod. Univ. Hist. 8vo, vol. XXX. p. 390.

“ between the *French* and *Imperial* Plenipotentiaries
 “ as to other points, they agreed, or rather com-
 “ bined together, to have the clause inserted,—
 “ this affair having been secretly concerted among
 “ the whole Popish party, who are always firm to
 “ the interests of their religion, and zealous for
 “ them,” &c.^e notwithstanding the intervention
 of the most solemn covenants, and all for the
 honour of Roman Catholicism.

By the Treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt*, 1707, it was
 stipulated, that “ The King of *Sweden* [*Charles*
 “ XII.] and the King Elector [*Augustus*], as mem-
 “ bers of the *Germanic* body, should act jointly
 “ for the conservation of religion as established
 “ by the Treaties of *Munster* and *Osnaburg* [*West-*
 “ *phalia*]; that no change of religion should be
 “ admitted in *Saxony* or *Lusatia*; and that the
 “ Roman Catholics should be denied churches,
 “ schools, academies, colleges, and monasteries,
 “ within these several districts^f.”

But *Augustus's* good fortune having restored
 him to the throne of *Poland*, all that had been
 covenanted at *Alt-Ranstadt* was overturned, but
 not without some scruples on the part both of the
 King and the People. *Augustus* had been bred
 in the Protestant religion, where the strict obliga-
 tion of Oaths and Covenants, and the iniquity of

^e *Tindal's Continuation of Rapin*, 8vo, 1761, vol. XIV, p 408,
 409.

^f *Mod. U. H.* vol. XXXIV. p. 372.

breaking them, is taught in agreement with the Scriptures. He could not therefore be without some degree of compunction in so totally violating all the solemn engagements he had entered into at *Alt-Ranstadt*. He had learned, however, from his new religion, that *The Peace of the Church* effectually healed all breaches of this kind. “Ap-
 “plication was therefore made to the court of
 “*Rome*, to release the King from the obligations
 “contracted by the Treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt*. A
 “few of the more tender consciences might be
 “hurt with seeing him re-assume without scruple
 “that Diadem which he had solemnly renounced,
 “and confirmed by the most sacred obligations to
 “another. The Pontiff’s absolving power would
 “apply remedies to be found neither in policy
 “nor human reason. The Nuncio granted the
 “absolution required, *and all good Catholics were*
 “*then unanimous that the oaths taken by Augustus*
 “*were of no signification*.”

In the twenty-first Article of the Treaty of *Utrecht*, the *French King* stipulates with the *Queen of Great Britain*, that “he will, in friend-

§ *Mod. Univ. Hist.* vol. XXXIV, p. 387. Among others, the Emperor *Joseph* had guaranteed this Treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt*; but we do not read that he interposed on this occasion, or that he at all opposed the infraction of it; nor is it said how he came off with the Pope for thus deserting his engagement. We are therefore left to suppose that he reconciled this conduct to the rules of morality, by the general principle, that *no faith is to be kept with Heretics*.

“ship

“Ship to the Queen, grant, in his Treaty with
 “the Empire, all things concerning religion to
 “be settled according to the Treaties of *West-*
 “*phalia* ^h.”

This, we may be sure, alarmed his Holiness sufficiently, and was the immediate occasion of the following address to the Emperor *Charles VI.*

“TO our most beloved Son in Christ, CHARLES, the Catholic King of the *Spains*, the illustrious King of *Hungary* and *Bohemia*, elected to be Emperor of the *Romans* ; CLEMENT XI. Pope.

Our most dear Son in Christ, Health, and apostolical Benediction.

^h *Tindal's* Contin. vol. VI. p. 285.

“Charissimo in Christo Filio nostro CAROLO Hispaniarum Catholico, nec non Hungariæ & Bohemiæ Regi illustri, in Romanorum Imperatorum electo, CLEMENS P. P. XI.

Charissime in Christo, Fili noster, Salutem & Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Plurima sanè & fervida studia, quæ ab Heterodoxis Principibus adhiberi novimus in tractationibus *Ultratrajecti* institutis, ut quidquid prope finem quarti articuli Pacificationis *Ryswicensis* favore Catholicorum & orthodoxæ Fidei adjectum fuit, penitus abrogetur; è contra vero *Westphaliæ* Pacis capita ad Religionis negotium pertinentia, nedum olim ab hac Sanctâ Sede reprobata, sed & per ipsum articulum quartum *Ryswicensem* correctâ instaurantur, & executioni demandentur (qua de re, non ita pridem Majestati tuæ fusè perscripsimus), nobis in memoriam revocant infelices illas, & nunquam satis deplorandas pactiones, quas dudum eodem plane consilio inferendi Abominationem in loco sancto, *Sueci* Plenipotentarii sive Commissarii, non minus violenter quam injuste expresserunt a Plenipotentariis, seu Commissariis clamm. *Josephi*, dum viveret, in Romanorum Imperatorem electi,

The

The many and zealous endeavours which we know to be incessantly exerted by heterodox Princes, in the Treaties opened at *Utrecht*, that whatsoever was added to the fourth article of the Pacification of *Ryswick* in favour of the Catholics and the orthodox faith, should be wholly abrogated; and that, on the contrary, the heads of the Peace of *Westphalia* relating to the affair of Religion, which were not only formerly condemned by this Holy See, but likewise corrected by the said fourth article of *Ryswick*, should be reinstated, and carried into execution (concerning which we lately wrote to your Majesty at large), recall to our memory those unhappy, and never-enough-

germani fratris tui, quæque anno 1707, in Castris *Altranstadenfibus* inter eosdem utriusque partis Commissarios initæ fuerunt. Summus profecto dolor quo tunc affecti fuimus, cum animo reputaremus, præter alia gravissima Catholicæ Religioni ac Jurisdictioni Ecclesiasticæ per eas pactiones illata detrimenta, insignem adeo Ecclesiarum numerum tum in tribus Ducatibus *Lignienfi*, *Bergensi*, ac *Munsterbergenfi*, tum in ipsa *Uratislaviensi* civitate, ac in reliquis etiam *Silesiæ* Principatibus, vero Dei cultui eripi & auferri, ac execrandæ Sectæ impietati tradi & assignari, nunc maxime non tantum renovatur, sed majorem etiam in modum intenditur ac augetur, dum cogitatione complectimur, atque prospicimus quantam inde spem sumpturi sint A catholici, reliquas etiam eorum nefarias machinationes atque consilia perficiendi. Porro, etsi compertum habeamus Majestatem tuam minime latere, quam alieno a memoratis pactionibus animo idem frater tuus fuerit: quantopere doluerit, quod ob res suas tunc in arcto positas, ejusmodi duras, ac plane impias condiciones accipere coactus fuerit; & quo tandem æstuaverit desiderio congruis remediis, quæ perperam acta fuerant sarcienti

to-be-lamented covenants, which, plainly, with the same design of bringing the Abomination into the Holy Place, the Plenipotentiaries or Commissaries of *Sweden* no less violently than unjustly extorted from the Plenipotentiaries or Commissaries of your brother, the late Emperor *Joseph* of famous memory, and which were entered into by the said Commissaries on each part in the year 1707, in the Camp at *Alt-Ranstadt*. The great grief with which we were then affected, when we considered with ourselves, that, besides other most grievous

ac reparandi; quæ omnia ipse literis suâ manu exaratis diserte nobis significavit, & luculentius etiam ac uberius dilecto filio nostro *Annibali*, sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinali *Albano*, nostro secundem carnem ex fratre nepoti, per idem tempus apud eum agenti non semel explicavit: Et quamvis itidem ambigere nequaquam possumus, quin Majestas tua pro eximia pietate ac studio quo insensa est causæ Dei veræque Religionis, probe intelligat & agnoscat ejusmodi pactiones prorsus inanes, & suapte natura irritas ac nullius roboris vel momenti extitisse & existere, quemadmodum eas germanus frater tuus, a nobis admonitus, palam agnovit & professus est; & propterea optime etiam perspiciat nullam prorsus earum habendam esse rationem, nec illas a quoquam alligari aut observari ullo modo posse, nec debere: nihilominus, tum ut quæ semper fuerit, & adhuc sit nostra ea de re sententia, Majestati tuæ clarius & apertius innotescat, tum etiam ut Apostolico nostro judicio innixa, solidius & alacrius prædictas conventiones prorsus contemnere, ac ita illas habere possit, tanquam si nunquam factæ fuissent; Majestati tuæ per præsentem denunciamus, ac insimul, tradita nobis ab omnipotenti Deo autoritate, declaramus prænarratas dicti Tractatûs *Altranstadenfis* pactiones cæteraque in ea contenta, quæ Catholice Fidei, Divino Cultui, animarum saluti, Ecclesiæque autho-

detriments brought upon the Catholic Religion and the Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions, by those covenants, so remarkable a number of Churches, as well in the three Duchies of *Lignitz*, *Berg*, and *Munsterberg*, as in the city of *Wratiflaw*, and in the other principalities of *Silesia*, should be torn off and taken away from the true worship of God, and delivered up and assigned to the impiety of an execrable Sect, is now chiefly not only renewed, but in a greater measure augmented, and become more intense, while we reflect and foresee how great hope the Heretics will derive from thence of perfecting the rest of their wicked machina-

ritati, jurisdictioni, libertati ac juribus quibuscunque quomodo-
libet officiant, sive præjudicium etiam minimum afferunt, aut
interre seu intulisse vel alias nocere seu nocuisse quoquomodo
dici, cenferi, prætendi vel intelligi possent, cum omnibus & sin-
gulis inde secutis & quandocunque secuturis, ipso jure nulla ir-
rita, invalida, injusta, reprobata, inania, viribusque & effectu
penitus & omnino vacua ab ipso initio fuisse & esse ac perpetuo
fore, neminemque ad illorum seu cujuslibet illorum, etiam si plu-
ries ratificata ac juramento vallata sint, observantiam teneri, imo
nec illa ullatenus a quoquam observari potuisse ac debuisse aut
posse & debere, neque ex illis cuiquam aliquod jus vel actionem
vel titulum etiam coloratum vel possidendi ac præscribendi cau-
sam acquisitam vel acquisitam fuisse, nec esse minusque ullo
tempore acquiri & competere posse, neque illa ullum statum fa-
cere vel fecisse, sed perinde ac si nunquam emanassent nec facta
fuissent, pro non extantibus & non factis perpetuo haberi debere.
Et nihilominus ad uberiolem cautelam & quatenus opus sit,
pactiones prædictas aliaque præmissa, ut præfertur præjudicialia
harum serie, improbamus, rescindimus, cassamus, irritamus, &
annullamus, viribusque & effectu penitus & omnino vacuumus.
Age igitur, charissime in Christo Fili noster, ac pactionibus
tions

tions and counfels. Moreover, although we are certain that it is no ſecret to your Maſteſty how averſe your ſaid brother was to the Covenants above-mentioned; how greatly he grieved that, becauſe of the difficulties in which his affairs were involved, he was obliged to accept of thoſe hard and plainly impious conditions, and how earneſtly he deſired to repair and make good by proper remedies whatſoever had been corruptly tranſacted, all which he expreſsly ſignified to us by letters written with his own hand, and ſtill more amply and clearly explained more than once to our beloved ſon *Annibal* Cardinal of *Albano*, of the holy Roman Church, our nephew, by the father's ſide, according to the fleſh, then reſiding with him as our Agent; and although we can by no means doubt but that your Maſteſty, from

huiusmodi penitus rejeſtis, iisq̃ue omnibus quæ in earum executionem quovis modo geſta fuerunt reſciſſis, Eccleſiæ, Religionis, ac Dei cauſam fortiter tuere, & ab ejus patrocinio ſuſcepti tui regiminis felicia auſpicare primordia. Oſtende ſatis tibi perſuaſum eſſe præcipuas tuas partes, pro eâ quam obtines Imperii Maſteſtate, non alias eſſe debere quam in propugnandis Fidei & Eccleſiæ Juribus, quæ religioſiſſimi inclytique Imperatores majores tui aſſerere ſemper atque amplificare pro viribus ſtuduerunt. Ita plane perennem tuo nomini laudem & gloriam, cæleſtesque Tibi auguſtæque tuæ Domui benedictiones magis magisque conciliabis; quarum in auſpiciu, cum perpetuo felicitatis tuæ voto conjunctam, Apoſtolicam Benedictionem Maſteſtati tuæ amantiſſimè impertimur. Datum *Romæ* apud Sanctum *Petrum*, ſub annulo Piſcatoris, die 4to *Junii* 1712, Pontificatus noſtri anno duodecimo."

M

your

your eminent piety, and the affection you bear to the cause of God and the Church, perfectly understands and acknowledges that such Covenants have been and are wholly void, and, in their own nature, of no force or effect, as your brother, being admonished by us, openly acknowledged and professed, and, on that account, also fully perceives that no regard ought to be paid to them, and that they neither can nor ought to be alledged or observed by any person or in any manner whatsoever; yet, as well that it may more plainly and openly appear to your Majesty, what always has been and still is our judgement in that matter, as that your Majesty, being more substantially supported by our Apostolical decision, may with more alacrity utterly despise the before-mentioned Conventions, and esteem them as if they had never been made; we, by these presents, denounce to your Majesty, and at the same time, by the authority committed to us by the most omnipotent God, declare the before-mentioned Covenants of the Treaty of *Alt-Ranstadt*, and every thing contained in it which are in any wise obstructive of, or hurtful to, or which may be said, esteemed, pretended, or understood, to occasion or to bring, or to have brought, the least prejudice to, or any ways to hurt, or to have hurt, the Catholic Faith, divine worship, the salvation of souls, the authority, jurisdiction, or any rights of the Church whatsoever, together with all and singular matters

matters which have followed, or may at any time hereafter follow from them, to be, and to have been, and perpetually to remain hereafter, *de jure* null, vain, invalid, unjust, reprobated, void, and evacuated of all force and effect from the beginning, and that no person is bound to the observation of them, or any of them, although the same have been repeatedly ratified or secured by an oath; and that they neither could nor ought to have been, nor can or ought to be, observed by any person whatsoever; and that no right, action, title, colour of title, cause of possession or prescription, is or hath been acquired from them, much less may be acquired or accrue by any length of time; and that they create or have created no estate or quality, but that they ought for ever to be accounted as if they had never issued, and as if they were not extant, nor had ever been made. And nevertheless, for the greater caution, and so far as may be necessary, we disapprove, rescind, cassate, make void, annul, and totally discharge of all force and effect, all the aforesaid Covenants, and all other the premises enumerated in these presents which are prejudicial as aforesaid. Wherefore, our most dear Son in Christ, attend, and wholly rejecting all Covenants of this kind, and rescinding every thing which has in any manner been done towards the execution of them, valiantly defend the cause of the Church, of Religion, and of God; and from that Patronage

take the omen of an happy beginning of the Government you have undertaken. Make it appear that you are thoroughly persuaded that the chief part you have to act, agreeably to the Majesty of the Empire to which you are elevated, consists in strenuously maintaining the Rights of the Faith and of the Church, which the most religious and renowned Emperors your Ancestors studied to assert and amplify with all their might. So will you derive upon your name everlasting Praise and Glory, and secure to yourself and your august House the blessings of Heaven more and more, as an earnest of which we most lovingly impart to your Majesty our Apostolical Benediction, accompanied with a perpetual Prayer for your Felicity. Given at St. *Peter's* in *Rome*, under the Ring of the Fisherman, the 4th day of *June* 1712, and in the twelfth year of our Pontificate ^h."

R E M A R K S.

1. It appears by this Letter, that, from the time of the Council of *Constance* to the year 1712, it was the constant and invariable doctrine of the church of *Rome*, that all stipulations with Protestants concerning church-matters, that is to say, which granted any religious advantages to the Protestants, or withdrew any from the Papists, were to be considered by the good Catholics as *ipso jure* null and invalid from the beginning.

^h Transcribed from the Appendix to *Sydney on Government*, Edit. 1763, Quarto, printed for *Millar*, p. 70.

2. If

2. If the Pope does not belye the Emperor *Joseph*, his Imperial Majesty was exactly of the same sentiments with his Holiness concerning the Treaty of *Alt-ranstadt*. He looked upon those articles of it, which gave up so many churches to the Protestants, as of no validity ; but the necessity of his affairs requiring his present compliance, he could only lament his hard fate to the Cardinal *Annibal*, and express his desire of finding proper remedies to patch up the breaches thus made in the jurisdiction of holy Church. When *Augustus* re-assumed the *Polish* Sceptre, the Emperor's sorrows were assuaged of course. Whether he found the same spiritual *remedy* which was applied to the conscience of *Augustus*, or no, for deserting his guaranty, and for infringing so much of the Treaty as more immediately belonged to himself, his Holiness does not mention. His contrition, however, we may suppose, intitled him to *the Peace of the Church* of course, and so far, we may conclude, he died in the *Odour of Sanctity*.

3. *Charles VI*, his successor, by not acceding to the Treaty of *Utrecht*, avoided the temptation of incurring the sad effects of his Holiness's Denunciation. By what had passed at *Utrecht*, *Lewis XIV* only was bound to see that the Treaty of *Westphalia* should be confirmed in his Treaty with the Empire. At the Treaty of *Radstadt* in 1714, *Lewis* had an opportunity of performing what his *friendship* for the Queen of *Great Bri-*

tain had induced him to promise at *Utrecht*. But in the accounts I have seen of that Pacification, there is no mention made of the Treaty of *Westphalia*. And, as the Emperor stipulated at *Radstadt* that the King of *France* should execute the Treaty of *Ryswick*ⁱ, it is likely that his Most Christian Majesty's zeal for the Church took the lead, on that occasion, of his complaisance for the Queen of *Great Britain*. And indeed, if what another Historian relates is true, the remonstrances of her Majesty's Minister at the *Hague* concerning the fourth Article of the Treaty of *Ryswick*, which should have been modified at *Radstadt*, by substituting the stipulations of *Westphalia*, had no manner of regard paid to them^k.

The Roman Catholics will now be pleased to inform us, at what period, since 1714, the Roman Pontiff, or the States of *Europe* in communion with him, have either disowned the doctrines and maxims above-mentioned, or corrected their practice by others of a more creditable family. If this cannot be shewn, we shall hardly believe that the good faith of the individuals of that communion, where the interests of their church come in question, is secured to the Protestants upon any better grounds than a temporary dispensation, which will last no longer than the church remains in a state of inability to assert her authority, and reclaim her omnipotence.

ⁱ Mod. Univ. Hist. vol. XXV. p. 213.

^k *Tindal's* Contin. vol. VI. p. 141, 142.

A P P E N D I X.

N U M B E R III.

Copy of a Letter from an English Gentleman on his travels, to a friend of his in London, dated Paris, March 21, 1766. From the St. James's Chron. May 13, 1766.

Dear Sir,

IN compliance with your request, I have made it my business, to enquire into the present state of the Popish seminaries for the education of *English* and *Irish* children in *Flanders*, and along the coast from *Boulogne*.

I have also endeavoured to discover, what are and have been the views and designs of the Popish Jacobite party of *Scotch*, *English*, and *Irish*, the avowed Enemies to our present happy Constitution.

And I have collated every Memoir, concerning the character, conduct and situation of the young

Pretender since he left *Avignon*, that appeared to me to be well founded.

At *Boulogne*, which is an ancient, disagreeable town, situated partly on an eminence, and partly in a bottom, close to the sea, there is a *French* convent, very famous for the education of young ladies from *England*. At present they have about thirty *English* girls, from about eight years of age to fifteen.

There is likewise an *English* convent there. They have twenty, nearly of the same age.

At *Calais*, which is only seven leagues distant from *Boulogne*, there is a *French* convent, which has no less than seven and forty boarders, girls; all of them the children of Protestant parents about *Dover*, *Canterbury*, and other parts of *Kent*; and some of their parents are actually in the g ——— service, such as masters of ———, &c.

At *Graveline*, four leagues from *Calais*, there is another *English* convent or nunnery, where they have twenty girls or more.

At *Dunkirk*, not four leagues from *Calais*, are two more nunneries; in each of which there are above thirty *English* girls.

At *Bruges*, twelve leagues from *Dunkirk*, there are two *English* convents, one of which has, at this time, near forty girls, and the other twenty-three.

At *Ghent*, eight leagues from *Bruges*, there is an *English* convent for girls. They have only fourteen.

At *Brussels*, ten leagues from *Ghent*, there are two *English* convents. One of them has sixteen girls, and the other about eighteen.

At *Louvain*, four leagues from *Brussels*, there is an *English* convent, which has near forty girls, chiefly *Irish*.

At *Lear*, a small town between *Ghent* and *Antwerp*, there is an *English* convent, where, I am informed, they have about thirty girls.

This is the state of the seminaries for girls in that country.

The general prices for board and education are, from twelve to twenty pounds sterling a year. In some, music is paid for a-part; in others, that and dancing are included.

It should be observed, that they will not grant the Protestant children, on any consideration, the least indulgence with respect to their own religion; nor will they dispense with any other than the most strict conformity in them, to the observance of all the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic religion. Thus — if they have any Protestant books of devotion, they must lock them up, and peruse them in private; but in most convents they will not suffer the children to keep them. They must observe all fasts and vigils as strictly as the nuns themselves; must attend

tend at mass on all festivals or days of obligation to hear mass. — The gardens and passages, from one part of these convents to another, are filled with images of the virgin and their saints; and the passing those images without a courtesy is a forfeit of a farthing or a halfpenny. The forfeits, for the first six months, draw a good deal of money out of the pockets of the parents of Protestant girls.

These girls are early and carefully grounded in a partial History of *England*; and taught to believe, that the true King of *England* is in exile at *Rome*.

When it is considered, how few parents in *England* give their children the least idea of History; the designing artful view of giving them a false notion of it here, appears in a horrid light; and when it is considered, that these girls are to be wives to Protestant husbands, and mothers too of Protestant children; it seems more detrimental to have them educated in this manner than most men would imagine: and, that they acquire not only an inclination, but even a fondness for the ceremonies of the Romish Church, and an early attachment to the unfortunate house of *Stuart*, as they call it, is indubitable. I do not depend upon information, *I have seen* repeated instances of childrens attachment to each; and that so, as to oppose the religion and government of their native

native country, with rancour and fury, at *fourteen* years of age.

I must now return to the neighbourhood of *Calais*, where the first considerable seminary for boys is to be found.

At *St. Omer's*, there is a stately building (college), which belonged to the *English* Jesuits, before the Jesuits were expelled from *France*, and its dominions. On their expulsion, a party of secular priests from *Douay* obtained leave to settle in that college: these priests are partly *Irish*, but the majority of them *English*: they have under their care about fifty boys; and they have rendered a school at *Boulogne*, kept likewise by secular priests, of little or no note.

Their brethren at *Douay*, have near a hundred and fifty boys at their college.

Besides these, there is no seminary of account in the country, till you get to *Bruges*; where the *English* Jesuits, with some few *Irish*, that were driven from *St. Omer's*, are more advantageously established than ever.

They have formed themselves into two colleges or societies, aiding and assisting to each other, by the names of the Minor School, and the College. They occupy, at present, two very large mansion houses, formerly belonging to noble families in *Bruges*; but they have purchased ground, and are preparing to erect very stately, expensive buildings; for which purpose, they send emissaries

to

to *England*, from time to time, to collect contributions. They have one hundred and seventy-five youths in their college, *all of them cloathed in the Jesuits habit*, their ages from ten to twenty-two years. The Minor School has about eighty boys, from five to nine years of age. Between nine and ten they are sent to the upper school or college. In the parlours, at both schools, where the masters speak to strangers, there are whole and three-quarter-length pictures of the young Pretender, in regal robes, and in military dresses, with the ensigns of the Order of the Garter. Every pamphlet published in 1764, and 1765, tending to promote the principles of despotism, to extend the prerogative of the crown, &c. found its way to *Bruges*, where quantities were distributed in the college; and many of the indecent songs and prints, which glanced at the most respectable and first personages in the nation, were, at the same time, given to little boys in the Minor School: these, and the older boys in the college, are all obliged, strictly, to observe all the rites and ceremonies of the Romish Church.

In the Minor School, they board and educate for twenty pounds a year: in the College, for twenty-five, and include the habit. In the Minor School they do not wear it, and the parents find cloaths; so that this is much dearer than many schools about *London*: the parents of Protestant children,

children, therefore, have no excuse on the account of cheapness. And as to saying they do not meddle with their religion, which is the plausible bait to obtain Protestant children, I could give a striking instance to the contrary, which happened to fall within my own observation.

The situation of these Jesuits at *Bruges* is peculiarly unhappy for *England*; as the parents of the children who are educated there, instead of making excursions into the country in summer, go from *London* in the trading vessels, which are continually frequenting the *Flemish* coast, spend their time and money at *Bruges*, and return home, the greater number of them, loaden with lace, &c. to smuggle, to pay their passage and expences.

At *Louvain*, the *Irish* and *English* share the university; the *Irish*, in particular, have very large and extensive colleges: there they educate priests and physicians to export to *Ireland*, but no Protestant boys are there ^a.

^a In the *London Chronicle*, October 17, 1767, a writer, under the name of *Verax*, hath thought fit to contradict this account of our *English* traveller; but hath done this, however, in a manner that seems rather to confirm it. He says, *No English convent exists at Boulogne, but in our traveller's imagination.* But will he say, there is no *Hotel* at *Boulogne*, where *English* girls are educated? If there is, of what consequence is it whether such a house is called an *English* convent or not? Let us, however, attend to the ingenious and entertaining Dr. *Smollet*.
 “Here [at *Boulogne*] is a square, a town-house, and two or
 It

It is certain, that the whole disaffected party on this side the water were more particularly active

“ three convents of nuns, in *one* of which there are several *English* girls, sent hither for their education.” [*Travels*, vol. I. p. 29.] This is pretty near the mark. If this may not be called an *English* convent, it is at least a convent distinguished from two other *French* ones, by the circumstance of receiving *English* girls for education. If the *English* secular school for boys, heretofore at *Boulogne*, is broke up, the travelling gentleman hath very well accounted for it. *Verax* says, and he says truly, that, *English Papists are more excuseable in sending their children abroad for education, than English Protestants.* But it is not equally true that *English Papists have not opportunities of having their children educated in their own tenets here at home.* That the Papists of this country want instruction for their children in the tenets of their own religion, no one can believe, who hath taken any notice of the number of their priests, and how conveniently they are stationed for the edification of their flocks. And if any other accomplishments are wanted, it is said, and, I believe, upon good authority, that the Roman Catholic youth may resort to seminaries, where there is no danger that their religious or political principles should be disturbed. Some time ago, as I have been informed, an academy was opened not far from the metropolis, under the direction of a *French* Roman Catholic, for the accomplishment of young gentlemen in modern languages, mathematical learning, and polite and manly exercises. The teachers indeed were said to be Protestants; but the professed plan abovementioned of the academy is by no means unfavourable to the supposition that even the sons of Roman Catholics might learn what was there to be taught, without running any risk of being unsettled in their faith. How it is, or has been, in some other parts of the kingdom, may be understood from two remarkable letters which I shall give at the end of this note, written by a namesake of this critic upon our traveller. On another hand, it is well known that there
in

in sending over their emissaries in the springs and summers of 1764, and 1765. It is almost

is at *York* a large building called by the name of *The Nunnery*, which is understood to be a place of education for young ladies of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and which has had that reputation for many years. Nor is it to be doubted but there are other places in the kingdom where popish girls are entertained for the same purpose. But to return to *Verax*. He is extremely pleasant upon the notion of an *University* at *Louvain*, imagining, as it should seem, that the denomination of an university is not taken from its *institution* and *privileges*, but from the numbers that resort to it for education. Can a man who is ignorant that *Louvain* has been a famous university for so many generations, be depended upon for a just account of the number or quality of the pupils educated in it? At length, by dropping one concession after another, he comes up to every thing advanced by our traveller, who only says, that at *Louvain*, “the *Irish* have very large and extensive colleges,” without mentioning with what numbers they are replenished. As several writers in the news-papers have, at different times, been nibbling at this most seasonable letter of our worthy Traveller, it may not be amiss, to confirm his report by testimonies which will admit of no dispute. Dr. *Smollet*, having spoken as above, of the convents at *Boulogne*, goes on thus: “The smallness
“of the expence encourages parents to send their children
“abroad to these seminaries, where they learn scarce any thing
“that is useful but the *French* language: but they never fail to
“imbibe prejudices against the Protestant religion, and gene-
“rally turn enthusiastic converts to the religion of *Rome*. This
“conversion always generates a contempt for, and often an
“aversion to, their own country. Indeed it cannot reasonably
“be expected that people of weak minds, addicted to super-
“stition, should either love or esteem those whom they are
“taught to consider as reprobated heretics. Ten pounds a-
“year is the usual pension in these convents; but I have been
incredible

incredible what numbers of priests, in disguise, went over at those periods from *Calais, Dunkirk,*

“informed by a *French* lady, who had her education in one of
 “them, that nothing can be more wretched than their enter-
 “tainment,” p. 30. Let us hear another writer, who seems
 to give an account of a convent on the *French* coast, which is
 not in our traveller’s list. “*Ardres* is most delightfully situated.
 “— At the *Benedictine* convent there I placed my daughter,
 “which is in all respects better than either of the convents at
 “*Calais*, were it not cheaper. The principal nun speaks *Eng-*
 “*lish* very well, and is a sensible, well-behaved woman. I
 “conversed with several *English* young ladies under her pro-
 “tection, who all seemed happy and contented. Those pa-
 “rents, however, who would be terrified at the thoughts of a
 “child’s conversion to the Catholic religion, ought not to
 “send them to any convent for education in *France*. For
 “though they do not attempt to convert the children by any
 “direct means, there are many indirect methods; and the
 “ceremony of high mass must naturally have much influence
 “upon young minds. Add to this, they are obliged to attend
 “divine service constantly, and they are continually hearing
 “the bigoted part of the convent lamenting that so fine a girl,
 “so sensible a girl (or the like), should not be in the only safe
 “road to heaven; while perhaps the Catholic girls of the same
 “age throw out an insinuation to the Protestant misses, that, if
 “they were to die in the convent, they would not be buried,
 “but thrown into the town-ditch, and be eaten by the dogs.”

Mr. *Thicknesse’s* Observations on the customs and manners of the
French nation, chap. iii. Having not the book by me, I
 transcribe this from the *Critical Review*; and I suppose it to
 be sufficiently exact: my purpose being only to cite this writer
 to a matter of fact, which he had no temptation to misrep-
 resent, and wherein he is in full agreement with our excellent
 traveller. It were indeed to be wished that the religion of this
 gentleman had not sat so loosely upon him, as it appears to

and

and *Ostend*. Most of the titular bishops passed over; in particular, the bishop of *London*, who

have done by what follows. “ My daughter, who is now fifteen years of age, with, I hope, a very tolerable capacity, and who had been six months in the Benedictine convent at *Calais*” [should it not be *Ardres* ?] “ asked me upon the road, whether, if I settled in *France*, I would change my religion ? I concealed my surprize at this question, and replied, I was very doubtful whether I could do that or not ; and then, in my turn, I asked her, whether she had any thoughts of changing hers ? *I like the religion very well*, she replied, *and so does every English lady in our convent, who would all change, if they durst*. I should not have said thus much on the subject of religion, but that you seemed inclined to have sent your daughter over, and therefore I thought myself bound to say no less, and leave you to be guided by your own good judgment ; assuring you, at the same time, that I am under no great concern about the fate of my own children, having experienced too much persecution in my own person, and in my own country, to be *solicitous* to breed up my children (in a country where they must now in all probability live and die) to be subject to persecutions on that score.” So much for the *solicitude* of the father, and the *tolerable capacity* of the daughter. However, the more detached this gentleman was from concern about his own or his children’s religion, the more unbiaſſed witness he is of the particulars for which he is cited. For the traffick of conveying children from the *British* to the *Flemish* coast, and the occasions taken by priests of making use of that conveyance, we have the testimony of an eye-witness in the following extract from a late *Address* to the most reverend and right reverend the Archbishops and Bishops of the church of *England*, p. 8, 9, 10. “ It chanced that I visited the *Austrian Netherlands* a few years ago, and, amongst other places of note, my curiosity carried me to *GHENT*, where I met with numbers of priests of all denominations, who told me they had been several times in *England*, and purposed going thither

was treated by the *English*, on this side the water, with peculiar respect. It was remarked to them,

“again. Amongst the rest, I conversed with two Jesuits on
 “board the famous vessel which is employed in conveying pas-
 “sengers to *Brussels*, and from thence to *Ghent*. Upon my
 “taking the liberty to ask them, which way they were going?
 “they told me very frankly, *they were steering for England*.
 “And I pray, friends, to what purpose (I replied), when you
 “acknowledge you cannot speak the language of the country?
 “Our good brethren (they answered) *will soon instruct us in that*.
 “I also found an *English-woman* on board the same vessel, who
 “owned ingenuously to me, that her principal employment was
 “to convey young children from *England* to *Bruges* for their
 “education, and to fetch them back again to their parents
 “when that was completed. I do not recollect what number
 “of children she had with her at that time, nor is it of much
 “consequence; but what struck me the most, was the nature
 “of her occupation, and the facility with which she imparted
 “it to her countryman.” After this, the number of *English*
 Protestant children, mentioned by our traveller to be in the
French and *Flemish* convents, will hardly seem incredible, when
 here is a person who gets her maintenance by transporting them
 backwards and forwards. If any one is desirous of seeing more
 of the bad consequences of this kind of education, I would re-
 commend the perusal of an admirable Letter in the *St. James’s*
Chronicle, January 21, 1768, signed ANTIGALLICA. That
 the Papists have no occasion to complain of the want of semina-
 ries in this country for the education of their children in their
 own way, the two following letters seem to prove pretty plainly.

To the Printer of the LONDON CHRONICLE.

“S I R,

Birmingham, Jan. 30.

“You will permit me, by your useful paper, to inform the
 “public of the following interesting particulars. Many com-
 “plaints having lately been made of the growth of Popery
 that

that it was to be feared such a number of Jesuits had retired to *England*, that offence would be

“ among us, and of the arts of its priests in making profelytes,
 “ I have lately had an opportunity of discovering a practice in-
 “ troduced amongst us under their patronage, which is and
 “ must be in its consequences destructive to the trade of this
 “ kingdom, in the preservation of which we are all concerned.
 “ In the parish of *Sedgeley*, between *Dudley* and *Wolverhampton*,
 “ is a large house employed as a school, in which are boarded
 “ and educated more than one hundred boys, many of whom
 “ are foreigners; who are put out as apprentices to various
 “ branches of trade [in] which that country is known to excel,
 “ especially in the manufacture of iron and brass. Now, Sir,
 “ as this can only be done to enable them to employ that skill
 “ which they acquire among us for the benefit of their own
 “ country, it becomes highly necessary, in my opinion, this
 “ evil should be inquired into and prevented; it being equally
 “ as pernicious in its consequences, and more lasting in its ef-
 “ fects, than the seduction of our workmen by strangers, which
 “ we have always attempted to hinder by the most severe pe-
 “ nalty. Are not such men enemies to the nation in its civil
 “ capacity? Should they not be restrained, lest the evil should
 “ be past remedy? Permit me to mention one thing more which
 “ has fallen under my notice. A Protestant with whom I am
 “ acquainted was strongly solicited to send his son to this school,
 “ and it is to be feared many may be unwarily drawn into it on
 “ a promise of having their education *gratis*. However, it is
 “ well known that the Papists, who are numerous, are supplied
 “ with apprentices from this seminary; many of whom are the
 “ children of Protestants educated at this place, with what view,
 “ but for the promotion and increase of the Catholic religion?
 “ If what I have related is fact, then it is incumbent on those
 “ who have power and authority, to remedy the evil complained
 “ of. This they will do, if they regard the present or future
 “ interest of church or state. I am, Sir, your's, &c.

“ V E R A X.”

taken at it. The answer was, their friends and patrons were too wise to molest them; that they

“ P. S. Large additions being now making to *Sedgeley* park, it is reported they are intended as a school for girls.” LONDON CHRONICLE, February 4, 1766, p. 117.

This Letter having raised the curiosity of another of the Printer's correspondents, a more particular account of these matters was requested, under the signature of *Defensor*. To which the following answer was inserted in the LONDON CHRONICLE of April 15, 1766, p. 355.

“ To the Printer of the LONDON CHRONICLE.

“ SIR,

“ In compliance with *Defensor's* request some time ago in your Paper, please to insert the following particulars.—In the parish of *Egebaston*, adjoining to this town, is now, and has been for many years, a Popish school of great eminence; in this parish many converts have been made to Popery, particularly a friend of mine, who, in the abundance of his zeal for the propagation of his new religion, willingly sent his son abroad, to be educated for the church. In the parish of *Salihall*, six miles from hence, the number of Papists is amazingly increased; they have lately erected a building for their religious worship, which has the appearance of a gentleman's house. At *Badsty Clinton*, five miles further, they are numerous; at *Grove Park*, four miles, you have them again; from hence to *Wotten Woven* near *Henly*, four miles, they are in great numbers; four miles beyond is *Caughton*, near *Alcester*, where many converts have been added to them, some of whom I know. In this place more people resort to their place of worship, than to the parish church. At *Stikts*, at *Pecly*, eight miles from hence, where there is another large school, or was lately, they abound, though their exact numbers cannot by me be ascertained; yet I am fully persuaded,

had

had carried money with them, and placed it in the *English* funds; and that the T—— of E—— wanted recruiting too much, for them to regard through whose hands property was brought into the nation.

Much about the same periods, vast quantities of Popish books, prints, pictures, and other such holy lumber, were sent over; together with several complete sets of *French* prints of the House, called of *Stuart*.

Since the change of the Administration, they seem quite dejected; and since the bustle that has been made in *London* about private Mass-houses, the priests have come back, like herrings, in shoals. I hope, by this circumstance among others, that the present Administration are the trusty, right characters we have always imagined them to be.

“could they be known, the amount would be found very large.”

—— I omit the remaining part of this Letter, signed likewise *VERAX*, as descending to particulars not necessary to be mentioned, and thus far is sufficient to shew the mistake of the other *Verax* of *October* 17, 1767, with respect to the opportunities *English* Roman Catholics have of educating their children in their own tenets at home, and shall only farther observe that we have subjoined to this letter the following Postscript.
“P. S. As I know all the places mentioned above, I am certain
“of the truth of my assertions concerning them.” See the apprehensions of *Verax* in the former of these letters too well confirmed, in the *Public Advertiser*, Wednesday, *January* 27, 1768.

If they did but know what a spirit of intolerance, of oppression, and of the rankest bigotry and enthusiasm reigns throughout the Queen of Hungary's dominions in *Flanders*, surely they would make use of reprisals. No Protestant can obtain a settlement in that country; nor even baptize, much more educate a child in his own way. We humbled *France*, we humbled *Spain*, might have for ever! But we left unpunished that ungrateful bigot; whose deputies in *Flanders* will hardly suffer an *Englishman* to breathe; and who have oppressed the *British* commerce to such a degree, that it must be totally lost in a short time. Yet we conquered this country for her!

It is to be hoped that some method will be taken at home, to prevent all persons going into, and out of the kingdom, as they please, without the least notice or examination; otherwise Popery must flourish in *England*.

The Popish party have depended much on the unsettled, roving disposition of the people of *England*, both with respect to their political and religious tenets. They boast much of the increase of the Methodists, and talk of that sect with rapture; while they enlarge on the negligence and profligate manners of the clergy of the church of *England*. How far the Methodists and Papists stand connected in principles I know not; but I believe

believe it is beyond a doubt, that they are in constant correspondence with each other ^b.

^b I would willingly hope, some doubt may be made of this. There is indeed one remarkable incident, which might reasonably enough create a suspicion of this sort, namely, the late publication of the life of *Francis Xavier*, the famous Jesuit Missionary to the *Indies*, abridged from *Father Bobours*, a member of the same order. The *Monthly Reviewers* for May 1765, inform us, that this abridgment is the work of Mr. *James Morgan*, one of Mr. *Wesley's* preachers. It is a pity this abridger should not have been apprized from what kind of vouchers *Bobours* compiled his life of *Xavier*, and what strong imputations of forgery fell upon *Tursellin*, *Ribadeneira*, and *Alegambe*, from whom *Bobours* had his materials, even from the learned and more free-thinking Papists themselves. *Xavier* was one of the first associates of *Loyola*, and whether *Xavier* was the dupe of his master's politics, or a conscious accomplice, is by no means a clear case. Lay the books of *Tursellin*, *Ribadeneira*, *Alegambe*, and *Bobours* (which contain a heap of palpable fictions from end to end), out of the question, and very little is known how *Xavier* passed his time in the *Indies*, but from the letters ascribed to him, in which some of his accounts are very consistent with the designs of a man by no means mortified to all secular considerations. *Stephen Pasquier*, a very learned and staunch Romanist, seems to have thought *Xavier* as deep in what he calls the *piperies* of the Jesuits, as any of the fraternity; if so, he was a knave and a hypocrite. Suppose him sincere, and he was at the best a crack-brained enthusiast, and in neither case a proper example for pious and rational Protestants. And therefore it were to be wished, for the credit of Mr. *Wesley* and his followers, who would be understood to espouse the principles of our first Reformers, that they would publicly disavow this superstitious publication, and every other (if such others there are among them) of the same tendency. In the mean time, it ought to be mentioned to Mr. *Whitfield's* praise, that he took timely care to preclude all suspicions of his

The young Pretender, by the best informations I could procure, which, indeed, vary, and are difficult to be relied on, retired to *Avignon*, after his disgrace of being arrested in this city, and stayed there a few months. He then went to *Liege*, where he lived some time in a very private manner, and took the title of *Baron de Montgomerie*. How long he lived thus, or what private excursions he made into other countries, I know not: But about the year 1757, he settled at *Bouillon*, where he continued to the time of his departure for *Rome*, on account of the death of his father.

He was privately visited by several persons from *England*, in the summers 1764, 1765.

His person is tall, and rather lusty; his complexion has a redness in it not unlike the effects of drinking: he has a complaint in his legs, which obliges him to wear a kind of half-boots.

It has generally been reported, that he was totally imbecile; that he gives himself up to drinking; and that he has a secret tendency to the Protestant religion; all which circumstances are notoriously false.

having any connexions with Popery, by his account of some remarkable *Ecclesiastical Entertainments*, as he calls them in his Letters from *Lisbon*, published in the year 1755, in which are many sensible and pertinent observations, well worth the notice of all Protestants.

He

He is pusillanimous to an incredible degree ; and it is now well known here too, as in *Scotland* and *England*, that even at the battle of *Culloden* he withdrew, before the Rebel-army was broken : but as to his love of drinking, or any acts which denote him to be turned foolish ; these reports owe their origin to some frantick tricks he played on his mistress leaving him, and either really, or as he imagined, secreting herself in a convent at *Bouillon*. It is certain, that he fired a pistol toward the convent, a ball from which passed through one of the windows of it, and wounded a nun in the shoulder. At that time he likewise addicted himself to drinking, in the first heats of his fury for the elopement of that mistress, a *French* lady of distinction : But this incident happened several years ago ; and he has lately always appeared calm and composed, talked very rationally, and read much, and been fond of music.

As to his religion, there is not a greater bigot upon earth : He has his bottle for holy water at his bed's head ; he never mounts his horse, or goes out on a shooting party, but he crosses himself many times ; and is strongly attached to the grossest fooleries of the *Romish* religion ^c.

Many of his friends declare, that he was so exasperated by his arrest and the breaking open his house here, from whence a letter was said to

^c See Dr. *Sharpe's* Letters from *Italy*.

be carried off, written by the *French* King, promising him perpetual protection, and a princely revenue, that he never will enter into any measures proposed to him by that Monarch.

By the accounts just arrived here from *Rome*, I have learnt the further following particulars concerning him and his family.

On the death of the old Gentleman, the Cardinal, his son, wrote a letter to the Pope, to acquaint him with that event; and to request his protection for his brother. This letter was accompanied by a memorial. A congregation of Cardinals was convened to deliberate on those matters. A public funeral was resolved on, and much superfluous pageantry appeared in it: yet no cannons were permitted to be drawn in the procession, nor to be fired on the occasion. As soon as the body was removed from the palace of the *Santi Apostoli* [the Pretender's palace], the sentry-boxes were taken away, and the guard-room shut up, by order of the Secretary of State; and not long after, the arms of *England* were taken down from it, by a second order.

In regard to the question, whether the title of the father should be given to the son, is was resolved in the negative.

Things being in this situation, it was imagined the son would not proceed to *Rome*; and *Urbino* was proposed, and approved of by the Cardinal his brother, as a place of residence for him; and

an exprefs dispatched to meet him in his route, and apprize him of thefe circumftances. That perfon met him a few pofts on this fide *Florence*; yet on he went, under the title of *Count Douglass*, and arrived at *Rome* very unexpectedly.

His immediate declaration there was, that he would receive none but thofe who fhould give him his father's title. On the firft days after his arrival, a few perfons of different ranks vifited him; which being known, a fevere reprimand was fent them, and exprefs orders iffued, that no perfon fhould prefume to give him that title. He then refolved to quit *Rome*; but that refolution held only a few days, as is faid, from the difficulty of knowing what place to retire to; and how the matter will end is extremely uncertain; tho', it is probable, by his fixing on fome place northward, where he can receive eafily the vifits and contributions of his party, and from whence he can join them upon occafion.

Had he declared, when the Cardinal found he could not be acknowledged, that he defired to be in private, all ranks would then have received him with decency, and he would not have fuffered the mortifications which he has fince undergone.

The *Romans* had conceived him to be a debauchee; but his behaviour at *Rome* has been perfectly fober and affable.

The *Roman* government, it feems, allowed the father twelve thoufand crowns [about 3000 l. Sterling]

Sterling] a year, the reversion of which was settled on the Cardinal for his life; and six thousand crowns more were usually given him; three at *Christmas*, and three at the *Villegiatura*; which sum has been refused to be allowed to the son.

The only riches left by the father, are said to be one hundred thousand crowns, which are lodged in the bank at *Rome*.

I am now going southward; when I shall have passed *Lyons*, I will send you some account of that city, and the other general places of education, with which our countrymen have connexion, in this kingdom. Afterward, a like account for *Switzerland*, and *Italy*, unless I should get too much dissipated."

A P P E N D I X.

N U M B E R I V.

Testimonies relative to the State of Popery in *Ireland*.

- I. *Extract of a Letter, dated Ashby de la Zouch, March 10, 1766, in the Gentleman's Magazine for April 1766, p. 172.*

“ I T is long since I formed a design of communicating my sentiments of the state of the
 “ Romish religion in *Ireland* to the public, and
 “ the evil thereof, with a scheme for amending
 “ it; but meeting with an Extract of a Letter
 “ from an *English Gentleman*, who made the
 “ Tour of *Ireland* last Summer, giving an account
 “ of the Pilgrimage of *Lough Finn*” (see the
 Gentleman's Magazine for *February* 1766, p. 60),
 “ with the Gentleman's remarks on the pernicious
 “ confe-

“ consequences attending it, I could not any
 “ longer be at rest, while I thought of any thing
 “ that might advance religion, or the welfare of
 “ any of his Majesty’s dominions, especially that
 “ Island which Providence ordered to be the place
 “ wherein I first drew the breath of life.”

The Letter-writer, having given an account of some other superstitious practices in different parts of *Ireland*, and of the correspondence of the Popish clergy in that kingdom with *Rome*, for the purpose of authenticating these devotions, proceeds as follows :

“ In the year 1736, a particular friend of mine
 “ went a journey of about sixty miles, and where
 “ she lodged at night, she fell in discourse with
 “ the woman of the house, who took her for a
 “ Papist, as she spoke the *Irish* very well, and
 “ she did not undeceive her ; and in their discourse
 “ the woman asked her, if she had heard the
 “ news ? My friend asked, What news ? It was
 “ answered, that they had been praying for the
 “ young Prince, that is, the Pretender, by order
 “ of a Bull that came from the Pope for that
 “ purpose to all the clergy throughout the king-
 “ dom ; and that the priest told them, *viz.* the
 “ congregation, that in a few years he would come
 “ over himself, and that there would a massacre
 “ of the Protestants precede his coming. In the
 “ year 1743, it was a current report, that there
 “ was a night fixed for this horrid act, and that
 “ one

“ one of them discovered the plot; whether it
 “ was certain truth I cannot say, but in all my
 “ life I never saw so light a night, and several of
 “ our neighbours were cautious of going to bed;
 “ and tho’ nothing happened, yet how probable
 “ might it be to be designed? For, as a simple
 “ country-woman could discourse of it, and tell
 “ of the Rebellion nine years before it happened,
 “ what need there a plainer demonstration, as she
 “ took my friend for one of her own sect, and
 “ spoke it in the innocence of her heart?

“ About this time also, and while the war with
 “ *France* continued, there was scarce a part of
 “ *Ireland* which had not *French* officers recruiting
 “ in it; some appeared as young clergymen
 “ come home after perfecting their education;
 “ others, from their travels, to see their friends,
 “ &c. Observe, they were all, or most, *Irishmen*;
 “ and though they escaped the notice of the Le-
 “ gislature, yet they got several thousand recruits.
 “ How serviceable they were to the *French*, we
 “ need only judge by their bravery on board our
 “ navy; for several thousands of these Papists
 “ enter into our sea and land-service in *England*,
 “ in the time of war.”

II. *Extract of a Letter, dated Dublin, May 1, 1766. From the St. James's Chronicle, May 31, 1766.*

“SIR,

“HAVING some time ago seen in your Paper
 “a description of the danger this kingdom has
 “been in for several years past, from the machi-
 “nations of domestic Popish enemies, I expected
 “to have seen the heavy charge laid on them
 “contradicted, or some of the facts explained
 “away. Nothing, however, has appeared in their
 “defence^a, which argues conscious guilt, and
 “submission, for once, to convictive evidence, “that
 “there is, and has been for several years past, a
 “Popish plot carrying on in *Ireland*, in favour of
 “*France* and a Popish Pretender to the dominions
 “of his M——y K. *George*.” This, Sir, is a
 “truth as clear as the day to all but those who
 “are or have been engaged in it, or those who
 “have found their interest in affecting to disbe-
 “lieve it. Some of the proofs of it I shall recite
 “to you, and will relate nothing but known fact,
 “without any comment of my own. On the first
 “nightly risings of the people called *White Boys*,
 “from wearing shirts over other clothing, like the

^a This seems to have been written before Lord *Taaffe's* pamphlet and the other, concerning the trials of the persons accused of the murder of *Bridge*, appeared.

“*Cammissars*,

“ *Camisars* of the *Cevennes*, in *Louis XIVth’s*
 “ time ^b, notice was given to the Government of
 “ their proceedings from time to time, but long
 “ disregarded, nor even listened to, till some
 “ Noblemen and Gentlemen, who left their
 “ country for the safety of their persons, made
 “ vigorous applications to have them timely sup-
 “ pressed, and pointed out the methods most
 “ likely to take effect.——

“ —— They were told, it was their own
 “ fault, that these risings were not speedily sup-
 “ pressed; that they had a legal power to commit
 “ to prison all disturbers of the public peace; and
 “ much more to that purpose. A Nobleman of
 “ great fortune and spirit replied, it was impossible
 “ for a constable, armed only with his staff, to
 “ seize five hundred riotous persons; and requested
 “ some parties of the army might be sent to quell
 “ them. But all that could be obtained was to
 “ issue two or three Proclamations, recommend-
 “ ing, in very soft terms, peace and quietness to
 “ those deluded poor people. —— The danger,
 “ however, and mischiefs increasing in proportion
 “ as indulgence was allowed them, —— it was at
 “ last obtained that *Drogheda’s* Regiment of Light
 “ Horse should be stationed in the three counties
 “ where those people mustered. Many criminals

^b The *Camisars* or *Camisards* of the *Cevennes* were so called, not from wearing *shirts* over their cloathing, but from a loose linen upper garment, like our carters frocks, which was part of their usual apparel.

“ were taken, many detected, but the last not
 “ prosecuted. ——— One *Jesuit* in one of those
 “ counties was taken by surprise. His Letters,
 “ ready to be sent to the Chief, seized; in one of
 “ which were these words, *I shall send you twelve*
 “ *stout men well armed for the good cause, &c.*
 “ The information was sent by immediate express
 “ where it was proper. ——— It was said
 “ only the poor man was actually mad, that the
 “ twelve men were only designed to maintain a
 “ Possession, &c. ——— I shall acquaint you
 “ with what I do know. I know, there was not,
 “ at that time, a Papist in the whole kingdom who
 “ was not taxed, and, on pain of excommunica-
 “ tion, required to pay certain sums, to be dis-
 “ posed of some way or other. ——— Seven
 “ Popish Regiments were ordered to be enlisted
 “ for the service of *Portugal*, but dropped after-
 “ wards. ——— The Popish Noblemen and Gen-
 “ tlemen destined to command this Army — held
 “ [like that in *James* the Second’s time] a High
 “ Commission Court, and with full as much power
 “ over their own people as the former had.”

III. *Extract*

III. *Extract of a Letter, dated Dublin, June 8, 1766. From the St. James's Chronicle, August 28, 1766.*

“ SIR,

“ As by your Paper I perceive there is a great
 “ increase of Popish Friars, Priests, and Jesuits,
 “ in and about *London*, and that you have given
 “ very proper warning of the danger arising from
 “ such increase, I shall, in hopes of its falling into
 “ proper hands, assure you the increase here is
 “ beyond belief. On *Saturday* the 15th of *Fe-*
 “ *bruary* last, I happened, as my profession obliged
 “ me, to attend the Judges at a sea-port town in
 “ the West of this kingdom. After the court
 “ broke up that day, I went to dine at a village
 “ near the shore, where I saw eight Jesuits, four
 “ Priests, and eleven Pupils, arrive from *Nantes*
 “ in *France*, from on board a ship commanded by
 “ P—— D—— : Attending the Judges from an-
 “ other Assize-town, I saw these identical persons
 “ going to Mass; and, while I stopped, I heard
 “ one say, This place would serve for the foun-
 “ dation of Doctor F——’s school, as it is large
 “ enough to contain above 100 pupils. I am
 “ sorry to say, no notice was taken of my inform-
 “ ation. ——— But there is one Gentleman,
 “ eminent for his sense, and remarkable for his
 “ intrepid zeal for the laws, who hourly hazards

“ his life in the most riotous part of this kingdom,
 “ in defence of his country. This Gentleman is
 “ a Justice of the Peace for the county of *Dublin*,
 “ where no Judge ever goes, but the Justices
 “ themselves sit as Judges of Oyer and Terminer.
 “ As I think his Charge is worthy of being read,
 “ by inserting the following extract from it, you
 “ will oblige

“ your constant Reader,

“ I. C.”

*Extract from a Charge given to the Grand Jury
 of the County of Dublin, at the Quarter-Sessions
 held for the said County at Kilmainham, on the
 9th day of April 1766, by Sir EDWARD
 NEWNHAM, Knt. Published at the request of
 the Grand Jury.*

“ — No doubt but you all have heard of those
 “ riots and unlawful tumults, committed by those
 “ deluded persons stiled *White Boys*. — The rea-
 “ son of my mentioning these circumstances, is
 “ only to remind you of the great necessity there
 “ is (should this county ever be unfortunately in-
 “ fected with such lawless people) that you should,
 “ as freeholders, join the proper magistrates to
 “ crush them in their infancy. — But
 “ though I am as true a lover of freedom, liberty,
 “ and the civil power, as any man, I must observe
 “ to you, that, in some cases, it is impossible to
 “ execute

“ execute the laws without a military force. The
 “ particular circumstances of this kingdom since
 “ the glorious Revolution, have made a constant
 “ military force necessary for the preservation of
 “ the Protestant religion, our liberties and pro-
 “ perties. ————— I will only state one case;
 “ suppose a rising of persons of the Popish per-
 “ suasion in a Popish barony, county, or district.
 “ A magistrate calls for the aid of the civil power.
 “ How can he get it? Can any man say that a
 “ Papist will arm against a Papist? It is an absurdity
 “ to imagine it. If that be the case, is not a mi-
 “ litary force necessary? Those well-spoken, but,
 “ I fear, not real friends to our happy established
 “ constitution, ought to fly to the posts of honour,
 “ and shew their patriotic spirit in repelling the
 “ impending danger. ————— I must observe
 “ to you, that though the lenity of our Govern-
 “ ment makes them wink at the Papists exercising
 “ their religion publicly, yet they will not remain
 “ quiet, notwithstanding that indulgence. The
 “ late trials in *Clonmell* and *Kilkenny* are sufficient
 “ evidences of their bad intentions; their swearing
 “ thousands of his Majesty’s subjects, they will nei-
 “ ther pay tithes, nor allow the established clergy
 “ to gather them; their levelling walls and ditches,
 “ under pretence of their being commons, are,
 “ in fact, nothing but a specimen of their more
 “ daring intentions. ————— There are of late
 “ numbers of Jesuits and Friars come into this
 “ kingdom.

“ kingdom. These people have presumed to set
 “ up schools of Popish superstition, and friaries,
 “ some of which are in your district. I am not
 “ for persecuting any persons for their opinions
 “ in religion. It is contrary to humanity, and
 “ the tenets of our most excellent religion, to pro-
 “ secute or despise a person for being of a dif-
 “ ferent faith from ourselves. But it is a true
 “ rule of human œconomy, that charity begins
 “ at home. I believe, most of the resident Papists
 “ of this kingdom would be peaceable subjects,
 “ if it was not for the arrival of numbers of Je-
 “ suits and Friars, who were banished from other
 “ kingdoms as pests to civil society. The wisdom
 “ of the most bigoted Popish countries have
 “ thought it necessary to banish them, for their
 “ attempts to overturn every rule and order among
 “ men; even Kings themselves have near been
 “ made the sacrifice of their blind zeal. From
 “ these circumstances, I should recommend it to
 “ your care to watch them; you have several ways
 “ to punish them, by presentment, or indictment,
 “ for assuming functions and characters not al-
 “ lowed by law.”

From a late publication relative to the affairs of
Ireland, in 1763, 1764, it appears that “ many
 “ of the persons concerned in the risings both in
 “ the North and South of that kingdom, had been
 “ indicted for high-treason, that several had been
 “ executed upon the statute,—that combinations
 “ had

“ had been formed against paying the church
 “ dues,—that these combinations had been at-
 “ tended with circumstances more terrible and
 “ alarming than was generally known,—that
 “ many Papists in the diocese of *Waterford*, who
 “ were tenants at will, and who were liable to be
 “ displaced to their great disadvantage, had en-
 “ tered into these combinations against the mini-
 “ ster of the parish,—that being acquainted, that
 “ if they did join in such combinations, they
 “ would be dismissed, they replied, that if they
 “ were dismissed they could not help it, that it
 “ would be a misfortune, but that it would be
 “ still the least of two evils; for they had better
 “ be dismissed, than have their throats cut, which
 “ would be the certain consequence of their re-
 “ fusing to concur in the combination. And it
 “ was understood, that a combination into which
 “ associates were pressed by the fear of death,
 “ and in which, therefore, many violate the peace
 “ of the state, contrary to their inclination and
 “ interest, might in a short time subvert the con-
 “ stitution, and defeat all the laws that had been
 “ enacted to prevent public evils, arising from the
 “ growth of Popery.” P. 47, 48—84, 85.

I desire it may be observed, that these Extracts
 are appealed to only as exhibiting evidence of the
 spirit of Popery in *Ireland*, at the periods of time
 in question; and that I have omitted all reflections
 intermixed with the narratives, farther than was

necessary to connect the accounts of the main facts, not only as I am no judge of the truth or propriety of such reflections, but as they are nothing to my purpose, which is to shew by competent evidence, in answer to the pamphlet ascribed to Lord *Taaffe*, and other publications to the same effect, that the temper of the *Irish* Papists has not been so peaceable and submissive to government, as the writers of those pamphlets have affected to represent. It is to little purpose to say, that these disturbers of the public peace were the scum and refuse of the people. Sir *Edward Newnham*, we see, was candid enough to believe that “most of
 “the resident Papists of *Ireland* would be peace-
 “able subjects, if it were not for the number of
 “Jesuits and Friars among them.” It is not unreasonable to suppose that the Roman Catholic nobility and gentry of that kingdom might find the means to controul the influence of these Jesuits upon the common people; and, as they are under the protection of no civil law, why do they not? unless they consider these Jesuits as incased in the armour of the church, to which good Catholics of every degree are equally obliged to submit. The consequences of which principle to those Protestant Governments under which they who entertain it sojourn, need not be explained.

POSTSCRIPT.

P O S T S C R I P T.

CONTAINING

*Remarks on a late Apology for the Catholics
of Great Britain and Ireland.*

WHAT has been offered in the foregoing *Considerations*, tending to shew the danger of tolerating Popery, will, I hope, be understood, as it was intended, to include a defence of the laws of our country that have laid the Papists under those restraints and incapacities of which they are disposed at this period so loudly to complain. Our ancestors took their accounts of Popish principles from books which the church of *Rome* had authenticated in form, and the circumstances attending the treasons and conspiracies of which so many particular Papists had been convicted, afforded sufficient reason to conclude that their Church patronized their attempts, and applied her principles to the justification of the criminals. With this complicated evidence before

7

fore them, it became necessary to guard the constitution from the effects of the perpetual machinations of these dangerous inmates, by such laws as would be most effectual in depriving them of the power of accomplishing the mischief they never ceased to meditate.

The present pretence for having those laws superseded, is, that the occasions upon which they were enacted no longer subsist. The meaning of which, to make this a good reason for silencing those laws, should be, that the Papists have now renounced those principles which rendered their forefathers obnoxious to the government under which they lived. For barely to say, that the Papists have not, for some years backward, engaged in the same kind of treasons and conspiracies that their forefathers did, is only saying that the laws enacted for securing the public against the pernicious tendency of their principles, have had a good effect: which, while the same principles are still espoused by the Papists of the present age, is the best reason in the world for continuing the laws against them in full force and vigour; as the natural consequence of repealing them must be, an immediate return to their endeavours to subvert our constitution, to which they must be urged by their principles with the more alacrity, as they might then take their measures for that purpose with impunity.

If

If indeed the Papists of the present times can give sufficient assurance to our governors in church and state, that they have absolutely and effectually renounced those obnoxious principles which their forefathers espoused, and have adopted others perfectly reconcileable to their dutiful submission to the present government of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, they will then have a plea for toleration, which must make all the arguments against it, taken from the contrary supposition, go for nothing. They will then stand upon the same footing with the Protestant Dissenters from our ecclesiastical establishment; and whenever it can be made appear that they have the same affection for, and the same common interest to support, the civil constitution of these kingdoms upon its present basis, the toleration of Popery, as a merely religious sect, will, upon Protestant principles, stand clear of all objection.

The question then is, “Have the Papists of these days disclaimed, or have they, in any degree, modified, the pernicious principles of their forefathers, so as to put themselves into a condition to be tolerated with equal safety to the state, as the Protestant Dissenters are tolerated?”

To enable us to judge of this matter, it hath happened very seasonably, and very fortunately for the public, that a book hath just appeared
on

on the behalf of the Papists, which gives us sufficiently full and clear information on that head, intituled, *An Apology for the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, humbly offered to the consideration of the King's most excellent Majesty, and both Houses of Parliament.*

The Catholics, as they chuse to call themselves, having furnished us with this test of their principles at a time when they thought it necessary to give the government the most favourable view both of their religious and political tenets, cannot complain of any wrong we do them, in being determined by their own representation : and if it shall appear from a short examination of this Apology, that the Papists of the present times still adhere, without any modification, to the religious and political system of the most obnoxious of their forefathers, the inference will be obvious, that they ought still to be kept within the same restraints.

Let us then begin with inquiring what were the principal inducements with our forefathers to enact the penal and incapacitating laws against Papists, now in force? And these were chiefly three :

1. Their acknowledging, and professing their absolute submission to a FOREIGN JURISDICTION, at

at utter enmity with every government administered by a Protestant sovereign ^a.

2. Their principle of INTOLERANCE, excluding all who differ from their religious tenets, or who refuse obedience to the foreign jurisdiction above-mentioned, from all civil privileges, and dooming them to capital punishment, under the name of Heretics.

3. Their assiduous and never ceasing endeavours to seduce the subjects of Protestant states to these pernicious principles.

The person at the head of this foreign jurisdiction, is agreed, on all hands, to be the Pope or the bishop of *Rome*, of whose preeminence our Apologist, in the name of ALL CATHOLICS, gives the following account.

“ In the Catholic church there is the Pope,
“ or supreme representative and vicar of Jesus
“ Christ upon earth, as being the successor of

^a Perhaps it should rather have been said, “ at utter enmity
“ with every government which will not admit of its arbitrary
“ decisions, whether Protestant or not.” For thus is the Pope
characterised by the *English* Parliament of 1536. — “ The
“ Bishop of *Rome* (whom some call the Pope) who had long
“ darkened God’s word, that it might serve his pomp, glory,
“ avarice, ambition, and tyranny; both upon the souls, bodies
“ and goods of all Christians, excluding Christ out of the rule
“ of man’s soul, and princes out of their dominions.” *Burnet*
Hist. of the Reformation, vol. I. p. 211. For doubtless this
was no Protestant Parliament with respect to the doctrinal ar-
ticles of the *Romish* faith.

“ St. *Peter* in the see of *Rome*; and the particular
 “ church of *Rome*, for this reason, is stiled the
 “ mother and mistress of all other churches, and
 “ the invariable centre of their unity. The
 “ heads of other particular churches are also
 “ all princes of the Catholic church, and vicars
 “ and representatives of Jesus Christ in the di-
 “ stricts of their respective governments, as are
 “ likewise all priests, for they all represent Je-
 “ sus Christ in the discharge of the functions of
 “ their ministry. But for the purposes of good
 “ government, the priests are subordinate to the
 “ bishops, the bishops to the archbishops, and
 “ ALL TOGETHER to the supreme representative
 “ of Jesus Christ, the bishop of *Rome*.” Apo-
 logy, p. 136.

But if *all together*, then the Vicar-princes
 among others, and the degrees of subordination
 will then stand thus, “ The priests are subordi-
 “ nate to the bishops, the bishops to the arch-
 “ bishops, the archbishops to the princes, and
 “ the princes to the pope.” But by lumping
 them *all together*, he avoided mentioning, that
 according to the catholic faith, the clergy *are*
not subordinate to princes, even in the districts
 of their respective governments, at the same time
 that the princes *are* subordinate to the pope.

With respect to the subordination of princes
 to the pope, he is indeed sufficiently explicit in
 what follows.

“ The

“ The Pope, by the authority of the power
 “ received from the Son of God, is the head of
 “ Christians, the pastor of the people, the fa-
 “ ther of Kings, and God’s vicegerent upon
 “ earth,” p. 138. And again; “ It has always
 “ been judged necessary that there should be be-
 “ tween princes, not so much an impartial chief,
 “ as an universal father of the whole family of
 “ Jesus Christ, who might decide their dif-
 “ ferences, moderate, by his counsels, the vio-
 “ lence of those who have engaged in unjust
 “ enterprizes, and unite their power and arms
 “ for *guarding the faith, from the attempts of its*
 “ *natural enemies,*” p. 139.

Will the Apologist then grant, that *heretical* princes, withdrawing themselves and their people from the obedience of the mother and mistress of all other churches, and of the universal father of the whole family of Jesus Christ, are *not* the natural enemies of the faith? It is a question of consequence to his Apology. For if he does not make this concession, it will unavoidably follow, that all Catholics, and *English* and *Irish* Catholics among others, hold it a principal part of the Pope’s office to unite the power and arms of Catholic princes against the natural enemies of the faith, in *Great Britain* and *Ireland* as well as elsewhere.

It is of very little significance, to Protestant princes, and Protestant states, that this Apologist pretends

pretends to limit the Pope's interference among Catholic princes to a mere *mediatorship*, with respect to their differences one among another. Their obedience to the Pope requires, that they should unite their power and arms against the rebellious sons of this common father of Kings, wherever they are found. And however gracious his Holiness may be to those who will accept of his mediation, there is plainly nothing, according to this Apologist, for those who will not, but utter extermination.

Where then is the difference between this doctrine of this Catholic Apologist and that of *Sanctarellus*, who, as the Apologist informs us, "taught that "the Popes cannot only excommunicate Princes, but also deprive them of their "kingdoms, absolve their subjects from their allegiance, and afterwards give their states to "whom he thinks proper, either for heresy, "apostasy, or for not having defended the "church?" p. 142. — In what does this doctrine differ from that of the Apologist, for if the Pope has authority to unite the power and arms of Catholic princes against the natural enemies of the church, and if apostate and heretical princes are such enemies, nothing can be more absurd than to suppose the Pope has not the authority, to use his own proper and peculiar power and arms for the same sacred purpose?

The

The Apologist would persuade us that this doctrine was thought *strange* when broached by *Sanctarellus*, even at the same time that he carries us as far back as *Gregory VII* (the famous *Hildebrand*) for the original of it, who lived near 600 years before *Sanctarellus*. Would he pretend that any of the Popes after *Gregory*, renounced this doctrine^b, or that *Sanctarellus* was

^b To the fact may be called a Roman Catholic writer cited by *Du Plessis* in his *Mysterium Iniquitatis*, p. 245. Ed. 1611.
 “ Et hæc ab Hildebrando, qui primus imperium pontificium
 “ condidit, quod successores per quadringentos quinquaginta
 “ continenter annos, invito mundo, invitis Imperatoribus, adeo
 “ auxêre, ut inferos superos in servitutem redegerint atque sub
 “ jugum miserint, atque cuncta fulmine perterritent,

“ Quo bruta tellus, & vaga flumina,

“ Quo Styx & invisi horrida Tænari

“ Sedes, Atlantæusque finis

“ Concutitur. Mutat ima summis.”

With respect to the Pope's pretensions to the power of deposing Princes, we have so strong an instance of the Holy See's inflexibility upon that point, in the State Papers collected by *Edward Earl of Clarendon*, lately published, that I need not make any excuse to the Protestant reader for lengthening this note with so curious and remarkable a testimony. In the year 1633, Father *Leander*, a Benedictine Monk, obtained leave of King *Charles I*, by the means of Secretary *Windebank*, and under pretence of visiting his relations, to come over from *Douay* to *England*. See p. 72. of these State Papers. When he was got hither, he was in no haste to go back, and, as it should seem, was permitted to stay, upon the pretence of being useful to the government in procuring the *English* Romanists to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy to the King. The Pope

the only writer who advanced it in all that interval between *Gregory VII* and *Lewis XIII*?

had issued a bull prohibiting the Catholic subjects of *England* to take that oath. *Leander* set on foot a correspondence with some persons of power at *Rome*, particularly the Cardinals *Barberini* and *Bentivoglio*, wherein he used divers arguments to shew the expedience of suspending the execution of the above-mentioned bull, and, among the rest, the probability of bringing over the whole kingdom of *England* to the Catholic faith by such a measure. He even set himself to defend the oath, and to shew, by certain qualifications of the terms in which it was expressed, that it was not incompatible with the obedience due from a good Catholic to the Holy See. Among his correspondents at *Rome*, was one *Richard Reade*, Procurator of the Congregation of the Benedictines in *England*, who went by the name of *John Wilfrid Selbye*. See p. 169. This *Wilfrid*, or *Wilford*, as he calls himself, had the care of *Leander's* correspondence at *Rome*, and, as appears, informed him, from time to time, how his intelligence and his proposals were received and relished by the Apostolic Government, which it seems was so very indifferently, that *Wilford* advised him, for his own sake, to meddle no more with the controversy about the oath, and having given *Leander* his reasons why the oath as enjoined by the *English* Government would not pass at *Rome*, he says: "I fear, therefore, some other form of oath must be thought upon, whereby his Majesty may abundantly, and superabundantly, if any thing can superabound in this kind, be secured of his subjects fidelity, and yet there be no entrenching upon subjects conscience, nor the authority of this seat, which, having stood for her right so many ages, in the cause of deposing Princes, will be very unwilling to permit the oath as the words lie, although glossed with another intention. Look over the oath, which usually is exhibited to the Catholics in *Ireland*; examine other forms of oaths in Catholic countries, add to them, augment them, and endeavour to form them in that kind, and in those

It

It is indeed probable enough that *Sanctarellus* might be put upon writing this book by the

“ words, which may secure and content his Majesty, as is most
 “ just and reasonable to be done ; *yet take heed of meddling with*
 “ deponibility of Princes, *for that article will never pass here.*”
Statz Papers, &c. p. 272. I cannot help observing that our
 Apologist seems to be playing the same game with this Father
Leander, and probably the checks he mentions, in his *justificative*
 piece (lately subjoined to the *Apology*), to have received from
 some of his own communion, might be in terms like these of
 Father *Wilford*. The Apologist pretends that the doctrine of
Sanctarellus appeared *strange* in *France*; which however was by
 no means the case; for, besides the remains of the leaguers who
 espoused it, it was not without the approbation of some learned
 men, who had no connexion with that infamous faction. *Gabriel*
Naudè, for example, Library-keeper to Cardinal *Mazarine*, cha-
 racterizes *Gregory VII* in the following respectful terms. “ He
 “ was one of the greatest pillars of the church, and, to speak of
 “ him *sincerely* and *impartially*, he was the first who put her in
 “ possession of her franchises, and *who freed the Sovereign Pon-*
 “ *tifs from the slavery of the Emperors.*” *Bayle*, GREGORY VII.
 Rem. [A]. And indeed, whatever might be thought of the
 doctrine of *Gregory* or *Sanctarellus* upon political emergencies by
 particular Catholic Princes, it always was uniformly the doctrine
 of the Holy See, and of the capital writers in behalf of the
 church, such as *Bellarmino* and *Baronius*, the latter of whom, as
 we shall see presently, derived this superiority of the Popes above
 Kings and Emperors from a much remoter source than *Gregory*
VII. In the year 1573, *Gregory's* body was searched for in St.
Matthew's Church at *Salerno*, and said to be found, and the
 following Epitaph inscribed upon a monument erected to his
 memory by *Marc Antony Colonna*, Archbishop of that see.
 “ GREGORIO VII Soanenſi, Pont. Opt. Max. Ecclesiasticæ
 “ Libertatis vindici acerrimo, aſſertori conſantiſſimo, qui, dum
 “ Romani Pontificis auctoritatem adverſus Henrici perfidiam

Spaniards, to mortify the *French* King and his ministers; but still we find it was approved and authorized by the *Roman* Pontif, and that the *French* alone, for political reasons, opposed and condemned the doctrine of it. The Apologist would have us believe that he approves of the methods taken by the *French* to suppress this doctrine, tho' indeed he hath no where said so in express terms. But all this is but mere grimace, for there is not one step taken by the *French* in contesting this unlimited power of the Pope, as represented by this Apologist, which he hath not reprobated in some passage or other of this very Apology.

“ The *Parisian* faculty of divinity, he informs us, in a full assembly, condemned the doctrine of *Sanctarellus*, though it was favoured by some of the old League,” p. 143. He might, and he ought to have added, “ and by the whole body of Jesuits.” What the Apologist thought of this condemnation, we shall see when we come to the reasons they gave for it.

“ strenue tuetur, Salerni sancte decubuit, Anno Dom. 1085. 8 Kal. Junii.” It is now near 200 years since this honour was done to *Gregory VII*, for his strenuous asserting the Papal power against the Emperor *Henry IV*; and if in all that time the Apologist cannot find one instance where the Popes have disclaimed it, he will bring his *British* and *Irish* Catholics into a disagreeable alternative, viz. either of espousing *Sanctarellus's* doctrine, or of deserting the Holy See in its claim of a *Fathership* over Kings. See *Bayle, ubi supra*, Rem. [2].

In

In the mean time we go on with him. —
 “ And not to leave the king’s power inactive on
 “ so important an occasion, the parliament, which
 “ was then the depository of it, cited the principal
 “ fathers of the Jesuits to appear before them,
 “ and obliged them to sign a declaration, whereby
 “ they condemned it, and to procure a like de-
 “ claration to be subscribed by all the provin-
 “ cials and rectors, and by six elders of each of
 “ their colleges in *France*; and the parliament
 “ afterwards ordered the book to be burnt by
 “ the hands of the common executioner, with a
 “ prohibition to all booksellers to sell any of the
 “ like quality.” *Ibid.*

The parliament of *France* decided in this in-
 stance, against the Pope, a point of his Holi-
 ness’s pastoral prerogative, of no small import-
 ance; a point, which, as appears by the li-
 censing *Sanctarellus’s* book at *Rome*, the Pope
 was by no means disposed to give up. The Par-
 liament did more; they obliged a whole body of
 ecclesiastics, the Pope’s own creatures, to con-
 demn the doctrine asserting this prerogative, by a
 formal subscription, and doomed the book that
 contained it to the flames.

Does the *Apologist* think they did right in
 taking this process upon them? He hath not
 told us whether he does or no; but we may learn
 perhaps a little more of his mind by considering
 P 3 what

what he says of the doings of another parliament on a similar occasion.

Speaking of the title conferred upon King *Henry VIII*, of supreme head of the church under Christ, he says, "Let us touch upon the
 " nature of the power that invested the King
 " with this high-founding prerogative, this blas-
 " phemous jurisdiction, as *Calvin* calls it, and dis-
 " solved his marriage with *Catherine of Arra-*
 " *gon*. What was the power that was able to
 " effect these mighty matters? it was nothing
 " more than the parliament of *England*; an as-
 " sembly of men that acknowledge themselves
 " fallible; for if they did not they would not so
 " often have rescinded their own acts. An as-
 " sembly of men, intirely calculated for judging
 " and deciding in civil matters, and for enacting
 " laws for the purposes of good government, ac-
 " cording to the several contingencies of temporal
 " concerns. But these same men could venture
 " out of their latitude, and what the consciences
 " of all the rest of Christendom abhorred as un-
 " justifiable, they, with a composure of con-
 " science, and acquiescence of mind in well-do-
 " ing, brought to pass." P. 59.

Every word of which *Sanctarellus* might with equal justice and propriety have applied to the Parliament of *Paris*. "An assembly of men cal-
 " culated intirely for civil matters — fallible —
 " often rescinding their own acts — confined, by
 " the

“the nature of their powers, to temporal mat-
 “ters—going out of their latitude to decide what
 “the universal Father of Christians might or
 “might not do in cases of Heresy and Apostasy—
 “and bringing to pass what, in the days of *Henry*
 “the Eighth, the consciences of all good Catho-
 “lics would undoubtedly have abhorred as un-
 “justifiable.”

Will the Apologist say, that the two cases dif-
 fer—that for a Parliament to exempt their Prince
 from papal censures in cases of Heresy or Apo-
 stasy, and to confer upon him the title and pri-
 vileges of the supreme head of the church, are
 two things, that, in point of presumption, will
 admit of no comparison?

I ask his pardon; the difference between the
 two cases, if he has given us a true account of
 the *Frenchmen's* reasons for their decisions, is im-
 perceptible.

“The *French* argued against *Sanctarellus*,” says
 he, “in support of their Kings, that they were
 “appointed by the hand of God, who had made
 “use of their swords [the people's swords], for
 “placing the crown on their head, and God had
 “not laid down apostasy, heresy, or any other
 “crime, as a condition to make void their autho-
 “rity, it being his will to make equally the good
 “and bad to reign; consequently they could not
 “be deposed but by God himself, nor forfeit
 “their authority by any crime.” P. 145.

But, if this be true, Kings are totally a distinct power from Popes; Popes can have no more authority over Kings, than Kings have over Popes. The almighty and immediate power of God intervenes in both cases to exclude all other authority; according to the *Frenchmen*, the Pope could have nothing to do with their King, even though he were an heretic or an apostate, and the Parliament of *France* in thus judging, and upon these principles, did indeed neither less nor more in effect than the Parliament of *England* did in declaring *Henry* the Eighth to be the supreme head of the church under Christ. For a King of *France*, being an heretic, was authorized by this determination to set up an heretical church in his own kingdom, and to become the supreme head of it, as much as *Henry VIII* of *England*, and with as little regard to the Pope.

For let us ask, how did the Pope endeavour to help himself, on this revolt of the King and Parliament of *England*? “He thundered a most terrible sentence of deposition against the King, and designed to commit the execution of it to the Emperor.” *Burnet*, Hist. Reform. Vol. I. p. 211. In other words, he put in practice the doctrine of the Apologist; he endeavoured to unite the arms of certain Catholic powers to defend the faith against a natural enemy of it. But the Parliament of *France* were of opinion that his Holiness overshot himself in this business, and had

had no authority to pass any such sentence. The Apologist may now choose whether he will acquit or condemn the *French* Parliament, for it is now clear that the Parliament of *England* must be acquitted or condemned along with it^c.

It is a vexatious case upon the Apologist, I own; but before we part I will shew him something still more wonderful, namely, that a King and Parliament of *England* could not only make a church, but upon occasion a Pope, and that in spite of the Cardinal-Electors.

But, notwithstanding his fair words, let no man imagine that he thinks as the *French* Parliament did. Shall he reverse his own system *du fond en comble*? If the *French* Divinity is good, what must become of the Apologist's *Father of Kings*, and

^c See Bishop Burnet's censure of Mr. *De Meaux's* History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches (at the end of his Letter to Mr. *Thevenot*, containing a censure of Mr. *Le Grand's* History of King *Henry* the Eighth's Divorce), p. 33, 34; where the Bishop observes, that "The *French* courts of Parliament are the
"last resort even in spiritual matters; and receive all appeals
"under the pretence of some abuse in the sentence, so that the
"whole exercise of the episcopal power is subject to the secular
"court. And," says his Lordship, "whatsoever they may talk
"of their union with the Holy See, even in this they are also
"subject to the secular court, since no Bull or Breve can be
"executed in *France* without an approbation from thence. And
"yet these are the men that complain of the King's Supremacy
"among us, tho' there is nothing clearer than that this servitude
"lies much heavier on them than it does on us." Which the Bishop goes on to shew. This Tract was published in 1689.

God's

God's Vicegerent on earth? A strange father surely, who has no authority to disinherit a rebellious and apostate son; and a strange vicegerent of God, who has no power or authority to punish apostasy, the most grievous crime that can be committed against God! For as the case is stated by the *Sorbonnists*, the Pope's spiritual power is excluded from it equally with his temporal. Whereas our Apologist is not for having the Pope made so contemptible.

“ Besides, say the *Frenchmen*, if Kings could
 “ be deposed by the Popes, it would follow, that
 “ the Popes are their superiors in temporals, such
 “ deposition being an act of superior jurisdiction.”
Apology, p. 145.

This however does plainly follow from our Apologist's doctrine. “ If the Pope,” says he, “ was made contemptible by the little respect
 “ Princes might bear him, what opinion should
 “ they have of his being able to effect
 “ those purposes?” [Namely, the purposes, among others, of uniting the power and arms of Catholic Princes for guarding the faith from the attempts of its natural enemies.]
 “ And what authority could he pretend to for
 “ appeasing their differences? *They would force*
 “ *him to keep within the bounds of his spiritual*
 “ *power, without interfering with their temporal*
 “ *interests*; and yet the fire of war would be
 “ kindled among them with such heat, as to de-
 stroy

“stroy themselves and their states in flames.”

P. 139.

Why, ay; to be sure the Popes have extinguished many more of these flames than they have kindled. But how should the Popes be able to do either without exercising a temporal power superior to the power of those Princes, with whose interests they interfere? Particularly how, without such superior temporal power, should they be able to unite the power and arms of Catholic Princes against the natural enemies of the faith, Heretics and Apostates? The doctrine therefore of the *Frenchmen* must be wrong, in the opinion of the Apologist, and his producing it with an implied approbation is but a copy of his countenance.

The reader will be pleased to observe, that, should the Apologist be called to account for these opposite doctrines, he hath managed the matter so as to come off by distinguishing between the *French* arguments against *Sanctarellus*, and his own in behalf of the Pope's superiority. And indeed, after the high-sounding attributes he hath given to the Pope, it would be ridiculous to suppose him in earnest, when he pretends to urge what follows in the *Frenchmen's* argument as the catholic sentiments of *British* and *Irish* Papists.

Let us, however, allow for a while, that the remaining part of the argument is his own, tho' ascribed to the *Frenchmen*, and upon that presumption examine to what it will amount.

“ But

“ But the Popes are so far from being superior
 “ to them [Kings] in that point [temporals], that,
 “ on the contrary, the most renowned of antiquity
 “ have ingenuously declared, that they were in-
 “ ferior to them, and that their power was purely
 “ spiritual. There is ample testimony of this in
 “ a letter of Pope *Gelasius* to the Emperor *Ana-*
 “ *stasius*; *Pelagius* I acknowledged the same, in
 “ a letter to *Childebert* King of *France*; and *St.*
 “ *Gregory* to the Emperor *Mauritius*, and in such
 “ express terms, that their intention cannot be
 “ doubtful.” P. 146.

This picking three Popes out of three hundred, of which three, *Gregory*, the latest, died eleven hundred years ago, to witness their inferiority to temporal Princes, is pleasant enough. But let us hear what they have to say.

Gelasius, in the Epistle referred to, says nothing of superiority or inferiority. He only says that the Popes and Emperors acted in distinct provinces, and were mutually serviceable to each other, *ut et modestia utriusque ordinis curaretur, ne extolleretur utroque suffultus*^d. The consequence of which doctrine is, that the Pope is excluded from every degree of temporal power, in direct contradiction to the Apologist, who is not pleased with those who are for *forcing his Holiness to keep within the bounds of his spiritual power*, p. 139.

^d *Gelasius de anathematis vinculo*, apud *Plessæum Myst. Iniq.* p. 78.

But

But this is not the worst; for *Platina* tells us, there were accounts extant, that this very Pope *Gelasius* excommunicated the Emperor *Anastasius* for being a favourer of Heretics, and particularly of *Acacius*. Of which *Platina* makes a precedent for other Popes to follow in similar cases^e. What security an Heretic Prince could have in the *temporal inferiority* of such a Pope, let the reader judge.

Pelagius, the next example, was in woful plight when he wrote to *Childebert*. He had, by attempting to force the Council of *Constantinople* upon the *Italian* Bishops, to please the Emperor *Justinian*, provoked those Bishops to revolt, and to withdraw from his obedience. On this occasion he applied to *Narses* the Emperor's General, then in *Italy*, to reduce the rebellious Bishops to order by force of arms; and, for his encouragement, decreed that "Heretics and Schismatics might be
" punished by the secular powers, when they
" could not be cured by reason and argument^f." *Pelagius* being thus at war with his neighbouring

^e Sunt qui scribant Gelasium excommunicasse Anastasium imperatorem Constantinopolitanum, Zenonis successorem, quod hæreticis & Acacio faveret. Unde constat imperatorem errantem in fide, & monitum, si non paruerit a Pontifice Romano excommunicari posse. *Platina* in *Gelasio*, 1 Edit. Colon. 1562. p. 61.

^f *Pelagius* — constituit ut hæretici & schismatici coerceri etiam secularium manu possent, quando ad sanitatem rationibus non deducerentur. *Platina*, ut supra, p. 69.

Bishops, he could not expect that much regard should be shewn him by the *French* Bishops at a greater distance, and who disliked the Council of *Constantinople* as much as the *Italians* did. In this state of things the *French* Bishops held a Council at *Paris*, under the authority of their King *Childebert*, without taking the least notice of the Pope. What should poor *Pelagius* do in such a case? A Council assembled without any notice taken of the Pope, might be a bad precedent for the Holy See. On the other hand, to anathematize their proceedings, might disoblige *Childebert*, which was by no means convenient. He therefore made a virtue of necessity, and sent the Confession of his faith to the *French* Monarch, to shew his obedience, as he says, to Kings, to whom the Scriptures enjoined subjection ^g. Now if any thing can be made of this with respect to Papal inferiority, it certainly is that Popes are inferior to Kings in *spiritual* matters; and if *Pelagius's*

^g “Quanto nobis studio ac labore satagendum est, ut pro auferendo suspicionis scandalo obsequium confessionis nostræ Regibus ministremus, quibus nos etiam subditos esse sanctæ scripturæ præcipiunt.” — How pinching must that distress have been which could wring these words from a Pope? It should seem indeed that some suspicions of his Holiness's Heterodoxy had been entertained by the *French* Bishops. We have heard of a civil Sovereign qualifying his submission to a Pope with, *Non tibi, sed Petro*. *Pelagius* might have some such salvo in sending his Confession to the *French* Council, *Non vobis, sed Regi vestro*.

doctrine

doctrine was found, I do not see wherein our *English* Parliament went wrong in conferring the supreme headship of the church under Christ upon *Henry VIIIth*.

The submission of *Gregory* to a Law of the Emperor *Maurice*, which intrenched no little on the privileges of the church ^h, is well known, and has often been cited as binding to his successors by Protestant writers; in which it seems they are justified by the *French* antagonists of *Sanctarellus*, and *seemingly* by our Apologist. But if we are to suppose *Gregory* to be in earnest in this instance, why not in those passages where he makes the title of *Universal Bishop* a mark of Antichrist? If this be true doctrine, what becomes of the Apologist's *Universal Father* of the *whole family of Jesus Christ*? p. 139. Be it not forgot, however, that *Baronius* will not allow that *Gregory* was guilty of either of these acts of humility; and boldly affirms that *Gregory*, in promulging the Emperor's law, made some alterations in it, and thereby shewed, it seems, that the Apostolic Power was superior to the Imperial ⁱ.

^h Ne quis miles, nondum expletâ militiâ, *Rationalis*, aut administrationi publicæ implicitus, nisi rationibus prius redditus, ad Ecclesiasticum munus admitteretur.

ⁱ Baronius utique, qui nihil non ad suum commodum vertit, ita promulgasse cavillatur, ut eam emendarit, in eoque ipso auctoritatem apostolicam, Principis lege superiorem ostenderit. *Plessæus*, *Myst. Iniq.* p. 112.

There is no occasion to proceed any farther with the Apologist on this head; and I have only gone through these last examples to shew his skill and fidelity as an Historian, and dare venture my credit that there is not one point of History in his whole book wherein he hath shewn more candor, honesty, or judgement, than in these instances ^k.

^k That such a writer as the Apologist should avail himself of every sophistical art in turning historical incidents to the account of his cause, is not wonderful. It is a trade to which, in all probability, he hath been bred from his youth. But one cannot without concern observe any thing of the like sort in a writer whose superior rank, education, and pretensions to liberal sentiment should set him above serving *any* cause by a partial representation of facts; of which, if he was not well informed himself, he had better have left the whole subject to the management of interested Priests and Jesuits, than have soiled his respectable page with the dirty colourings which were only to be borrowed from them. A few citations from a late performance, intituled, *Thoughts, Essays, and Maxims, chiefly religious and political*, the work of a gentleman of distinction, will explain what I here allude to. "It is allowed by all the most sensible and candid writers among the Roman Catholics," says this author, "that the many abuses which have crept into the practice and worship of the church, were PERHAPS occasioned IN PART by the corruption of the churchmen, and their too great plenitude of power." p. 42.—And, for aught that we gain by this *allowance*, PERHAPS NOT, even IN PART. For by these restrictions it is left doubtful whether any of these many abuses were occasioned by the corruption of churchmen, or their too great plenitude of power. And if these abuses did not arise from these causes, it might fairly be questioned whether there was any corruption or any excess of power among the churchmen at all? From how many writers of his own communion might this Gentleman

After all, he may, as I observed above, alledge, that he does not make himself answerable either

Have learned how little room there is for such *salvos* and *limitations*? The single Remonstrance of the Council of *Pisa* to the Emperor *Maximilian*, dated *November 12, 1511*, is sufficient to shew the state of the church, and the disposition of powerful churchmen, in those days. This was six, and but six years before *Luther* began his opposition to Indulgences. And concerning these the disingenuous *Bossuet* himself could say, that “most
“ of the preachers of that time treated of nothing but indul-
“ gences, pilgrimages, and alms to be bestowed upon the
“ Monks, nor spake of the Grace of Christ, as much as they
“ ought to have done.” *Hist. Var.* Part I. B. v. sect. 1. Nay, even this still more disingenuous *Apologist* could prevail with himself to acknowledge, that “the abuses of indulgences were
“ then very great, and cried aloud for redress,” p. 35. And since these abuses took their rise from the plenitude of Papal Power, it seems to be going below the *modesty* and *tenderness* of a bigoted Friar, to qualify the manifest occasion of them with a
PERHAPS and IN PART. The polite writer goes on: “But
“ then those who attempted to mend or correct them, either
“ through ignorance, pride, or ambition, in establishing their
“ own opinions, were so hurried away with their passions and
“ resentment, that they perpetrated murders, created civil wars,
“ and miseries among mankind for many years, and established
“ as many abuses, and allowed of as many evil practices in morals
“ as those they complained of, and pretended or attempted to
“ reform.” *Ibid.* Surely this atrocious accusation should have been supported by some facts, fixing the guilt of these murders, civil wars, and miseries upon the first Reformers. Will the most yawning reader take the following instance for a full proof of all this complicated mischief? “Witness *Germany*, where one of
“ the Reformers, in order to obtain the protection of a sovereign
“ prince, allowed him to have two wives at a time,” p. 43. This, it seems, is a favourite prejudice against the Reformation,

Q

for

for the doctrine of the *Sorbonne*, or the proceedings of the *French* Parliament, and appeal to his

among our *English* Catholics, and is, no doubt, understood to be the sum and substance of all wickedness; and our author's manner of introducing it puts me in mind of a story I have heard of a good Lady, who having surpris'd her husband in some suspicious circumstances with her chamber-maid, threw up the window and called out, *Whores! rogues! thieves! murder! fire!*

An exclamation to which the bystanders would have no great reason to pay regard, if, as in the case of the church of *Rome*, it had been notorious that the good Lady herself had first given an example of the like infidelity. "Gregory II, being consulted whether it was agreeable to the faith of the *Roman* church, that a man might take two wives, when the first was rendered incapable of fulfilling the marriage-duty by a long malady, decided, that, according to the vigour of the *Apostolic* See, if the husband had not the gift of continence, he might take another wife, provided he afforded the first a maintenance." See Mr.

Basnage, *Hist. de la Religion des Eglises Reformées*, Tom. III. p. 96. The bishop of *Meaux* pretended that Gregory's meaning was that the first marriage should be dissolved, which was a different case from that of *Luther's* allowing the Landgrave of *Hesse* to have, in Mr. *Howard's* phrase, *two wives at a time*. To which Mr.

Basnage replies, What is it Mr. *Bossuet* would say? Marriage is a sacrament which cannot be dissolved; and the Law of Jesus Christ, which ordains that it should not be dissolved but for the cause of adultery, is not regarded in the church of *Rome*? But Gregory the Second did not dissolve the marriages upon which he hath founded his decree. He decides that a man may take a second wife, when the first is become infirm and diseased. And the only clause of reserve in her favour relates to her maintenance. The one case is perfectly like the other; and, to confound those who may be disposed to contest it, I will add in favour of the Landgrave of *Hesse* and *Luther*, that the Landgrave's first wife, the daughter of the

own state of the case, which is totally inconsistent with them both. You will in vain ask him, " why

" Elector of *Saxony*, consented to the second marriage; reserving
 " to herself her rights [of dowry], and those of her children,
 " because her infirmities would not permit her to fulfil the du-
 " ties of marriage, nor to correct the violent love which the
 " Elector had conceived for *Margaret de Sales*, and the impe-
 " tuosity of his temperament. The cases are exactly parallel:
 " But can any one imagine that the concubinage or, let us call
 " it, the adultery of a Prince subverts the Reformation, seeing
 " that the late Mr. *De Meaux* hath born with a double adultery
 " under his eyes for a great number of years, and perhaps bap-
 " tized, communicated, and married the children born of this
 " double adultery? He should have been ashamed and have
 " reflected upon his own personal history, before he had made
 " that of others, and defended it with so much vehemence."

Basnage, u. f. p. 105. What advantage then do the Papists gain by this incident? They have been told an hundred times that the Protestants never thought themselves answerable for *Luther's* casuistry in any particular case, even though an hundred doctors among the first Reformers had joined him. If indeed *Luther* had taught the lawfulness of bigamy in general, and if from him the body of Protestants had taken that doctrine into their respective confessions, it had been incumbent upon them to have defended the *allowance* of *Luther* at all events. Instead of that, many Protestants remonstrated against any such dispensation, as contrary to the law of God, both at the time it was granted, and occasionally ever since. But the Papists are obliged to abide by all the dispensations of the Pope and the church in matrimonial cases of all kinds. It is to no purpose for them to plead that such dispensations are against the law of God. The council of *Trent* hath denounced an anathema against all those who should dispute the power of the church to dispense, in cases of affinity, with the degrees of it forbidden in the law of God. *Conc. Trid.* Sess. XXIV. can. iii. p. 874. And, what is most remarkable,

“ then did you give us this detail of *French* maxims and politics, with an air of approbation ?”

the *British* and *Irish* Papists who object to *Henry VIIIth's* divorce from *Catharine of Arragon*, by an incompetent authority, are obliged to support the validity of the dispensation granted by *Julius II* to *Henry* to marry his brother's widow, and must consequently approve the canon of *Trent* in its utmost extent. Lastly, whoever it was that informed Mr. *Howard*, that *Luther* gave this dispensation to the Landgrave of *Hesse*, that he [*Luther*] might obtain the Landgrave's protection, certainly imposed upon him. *Luther* had enjoyed the protection of the Landgrave for fourteen or fifteen years before this event. And it may be truly said that *Luther*, in granting allowance to this *evil practice*, ran the risque of losing the protection of all the rest of the Protestant Princes of *Germany*, who certainly disapproved the second marriage. And, as this affair turned out, the Landgrave actually wanted *Luther's* protection to divert the storm which was likely to fall upon him for this irregular conduct. For the Landgrave, fearing to be called to account by the Emperor and the States of *Germany* for this offensive step, treated with the Elector of *Saxony* and the other Parties to the *Smalcaldic League*, to stand by him in such exigence, and even wrote to *Luther* and *Melancthon* for advice how to manage in this critical juncture. See *Seckendorf*, Hist. *Luth.* lib. III. p. 277—281. The paragraph this respectable author hath thrown out to disparage the Protestant Reformation, is thus closed: “ Examples of equal immoral tendency, variegated and adapted according to the inclinations of the people they had to deal with, might be found in *France*, *Holland*, and *England*.” P. 43. Nothing can be more prudent in a Roman Catholic writer than to give these loose and general hints, without descending to particulars. These *variegations* and *adaptions* are so numerous and remarkable in his own church, that it would by no means be convenient for him to have the comparison entered upon in a circumstantial detail of examples. The *variegations* of the Bishop of *Meaux* alone, in his famous *Expo-*
It

It is hardly time for him yet, whatever it may be hereafter, to laugh in your face, and tell you he only meant to throw a little dust in your eyes, till an opportunity could be met with to shew you the difference.

sition, were so notorious, that they gave great disgust to the members of his own communion, even to the Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, which obliged him to suppress the first impression of it till the exceptionable passages were altered. Nor would it have passed uncensured at *Rome*, but for the boasts of the many converts made by it in *France*. On which sole consideration it obtained the approbation of the Cardinals *Capisucchi* and *Bona*, both of whom had published doctrines contradictory to some in the Bishop of *Meaux's* Exposition. See *Bayle's* Dict. CAPISUCCHI RAYMOND, Rem. [A]; and *Nouvelles de Repub. des Lettres*, Janvier, 1685, p. 15. but above all the Preface to *Wake's* Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, in answer to it. Had the respectable Essayist read the article *PIENNE* in *Bayle's* Dictionary, he would, I am persuaded, have spared his reflection upon *Luther* and the Landgrave of *Hesse*. Mr. *Bayle* has been thought, in moderating between the Protestants and the Papists, to have carried his candor in favour of the latter oftentimes to excess. But on this last mentioned occasion he finds himself obliged to say, "Nothing appeared shameful to *Paul IV*, provided he might find pretences not to annul the marriage of "Mr. *Montmorancy*." Rem. [D] at the end. But this Gentleman seems to have taken the Bishop of *Meaux's* word in the gross both for his account of the *variations* among the Protestants, and the solidity of the argument he grounds upon it. Whereas nothing could be more ridiculous and impertinent than the Bishop's reasoning, while so many *variations* in the system of Popery were upon record, and particularly so many innovations since the church of *Rome* pretended to infallibility. See *Basnage, Hist. de la Rel. des Eglises Reformées*, Tom. V. Edit. 12mo. 1721. If this Gentleman, by his examples, can clear the church of *Rome*

II. The Catholic principle of Intolerance comes next under our consideration. And there can be very little doubt of the Apologist's entire affection to it, when it is considered from what a venerable original he derives it, even from the *Jews*, for whose conduct towards Christ and his Apostles, he very handsomely apologizes, by telling us, that the Christian doctrines "were novel notions to the *Jews* — they were fully persuaded it was incumbent upon them to oppose all innovations; and it must be allowed, under such a deception of appearances, that there was some shadow of reason to plead for their *exerting* themselves in the way they did. This therefore," says he, "is all that can be said to extenuate the crime of persecution in the carnal *Jews*."

All that can be said! what can the man mean? Is it possible he should not think this *sufficient*, not only to *extenuate* but even to *justify* this intolerance of the Jewish church, when we find him concluding his apology for it in these *justificative* words: "For as *no interior conviction* wrought so prevalently as to make them judge that their Law ought to be abrogated, we cannot be much surprized to find them so tenacious of

from this manifest occasion of recrimination, he will then give his readers a good reason why he refers them to *France, Holland, and England*, for examples of *immoral tendency*, rather than to the kingdoms of *Fez and Morocco*, or to the country of the *Hot-tentats* about the *Cape of Good Hope*.

"every

“ every thing belonging to it, and so vigilant in
 “ guarding against whatever might be hurtful to
 “ its preservation.” *Apol.* p. 4.

The plain *English* of which is, that the *Jews* having *no interior conviction* that they were in the wrong, all that they did against Christ and his Apostles was very justifiable; *nobody can be surprized at it*, because it proceeded from an interior conviction that they were in the right. The consequence of which is, that every church, which is *infallibly* in the right, ought to suppress and persecute all who oppose her, as the *Jews* did by Christ and his Apostles. It is to no purpose to object, that Christ and his Apostles alledged the authority of the Scriptures for their doctrines, that the *Jews* had these in their hands, and ought to have examined them: all this wrought *no interior conviction*; and, while that was the case, we cannot be much surprized, according to our Apologist, that they did what they did to Christ and his Apostles, as that was only a necessary vigilance in guarding against whatever might be hurtful to the preservation of their Law. They had an *interior conviction* that they were in the right, and that was sufficient.

And upon this ground he builds the intolerance of the *Romish* church; for his whole apology turns upon the supposition that the church of *Rome* has ever been in the right since the times of the Apostles; that she alone hath had the power

of interpreting Scripture, and defining points of faith, and alone hath *just* authority for this purpose. The consequence is, that every one who contradicts her is an *heretic*, and every one who separates from her a *schismatic*. And, having thus begged his premisses, he concludes, p. 41, that *nothing can justify schism, nothing can palliate, much less excuse, the offence of shaking off just authority.*

Hence he infers the rectitude of establishing the *Inquisition* for the suppression of the *Albigenses*; and he thinks, that, taking it for granted that the *Albigenses* were what he represents them to be, the Protestants even of these days must agree that the *Inquisition* was a very proper method of dealing with them, “and a necessary and a justifiable measure,” p. 20.

I will not pretend to say what may be the sentiments of the *Protestant* company this Apologist may keep, nor will I presume to contradict the inferences he may draw from propositions that are to be found in books of no long standing, written by authors who call themselves Protestants. In every Christian society there will be mistaken and wrong-headed men, not sufficiently instructed in the principles of their religion. In every Protestant church or society since the Reformation there have been men violently prejudiced in favour of their respective establishments, and sufficiently hot and eager in defence of them, to desire

to distress their Fellow-Protestants who do not think as they do. These, however, are spots and blemishes in whatever Protestant church they are found; and, in respect of our own constitution, betray a spirit, which both the lenity of our civil government and the original principles of the Protestant church of *England* do most expressly condemn.

But this I will say, that they must be strange Protestants indeed, who, taking this Apologist's account of the *Albigenses* all together, will venture to agree with him that the institution of the Inquisition, for their correction and punishment, was *a necessary and justifiable measure*.

For he is obliged to acknowledge, p. 18, that there were among the *Albigenses* "men who led "an austere and regular life, declaring an utter "aversion against lies and swearing." Did the Inquisition make any difference between these and others of looser moral principles? By no means. He has not the assurance to assert it. *Heresy* and *Schism* then were the only crimes of which, with respect to these good men, the Inquisition took cognisance¹. And upon this footing the Inquisi-

¹ The Apologist labours hard to fix the Heresy of the *Manichæans* upon the *Albigenses*, upon the credit of such writers as *Bossuet*, *Sanders*, *Baronius*, and *Spondanus*, whom, in his *justificative piece*, he dignifies with the title of the *best writers*, tho' some of the really best writers of his own communion have been in many instances ashamed of them. The truth is, the Apologist

tion is equally justifiable at this moment as it was at its first institution. And if there are any Protestants so called who think the Inquisition a justi-

hath neither done himself nor his readers common justice in this representation. He could hardly be ignorant that the celebrated *Basnage* hath fully confuted the Bishop of *Meaux* upon this head of accusation, by the testimony of writers of the best authority among the Roman Catholics themselves; namely, *Du Tillet*, *De Serres*, *Vignier*, and *Guillame de Puy-Laurens*. *Basnage* observes, that the Bishop of *Meaux* takes care not to make the least mention of this last writer, "fearing that all his labour should be
 "lost, and all the vast collection he had made from so many
 "authors, with a view to suffocate us with their number, should
 "become useless, if he had intimated by the least citation that
 "there was such an author in being" [as *Guillame de Puy-Laurens*]. *Hist. De la Rel. des Egl. Reform.* vol. I. p. 239. In another place, Mr. *Basnage* observes, that "a Monk, named
 "Pierre des Valles de Cernay, is the principal author upon whose
 "authority Mr. *De Meaux* imputes *Manicheism* to the *Albigenses*,
 "who nevertheless is convicted of falsehood by the most credible
 "historians," p. 243. of which indeed Mr. *Basnage* brings abundant proof in the ninth and tenth chapters of this first volume. In one word, it appears, by the testimony of *Du Tillet* and *De Serres*, that the tenets of the *Albigenses* were those and those only of the first Reformers. "The reasons of their separation from
 "the church" [says *De Serres*, from an authentic record] "perfectly resembled those which were revived by *Wickliffe* and
 "Luther. For they would not receive the authority of the Pope,
 "nor acknowledge him for universal Bishop. They rejected
 "images, purgatory, the merit of works, indulgences, pilgrimages, vows, the celibate of priests, the invocation of saints,
 "and trafficking in things consecrated." And for the suppression of these and the like heresies, respecting the doctrines and the authority of the see of *Rome*, and such only, was the Inquisition instituted.

fiable

liable measure in this view, it is but justice to the rest that he should name them, on the peril, if he does not, of being held a slanderous calumniator.

After this, who will pay the least regard to his canting pretensions to the moderation and charitable forbearance of the church of *Rome*? If nothing can justify schism, nothing ought to screen or protect schismatics from inquisitorial punishment; and the church of *Rome* having no *interior conviction* that she is in the wrong, or, in other words, having *interior conviction* that she is *infallible*, it is impossible she should ever esteem herself to be mistaken in the proper objects of her punishments, which must therefore be all whom she judges to be Heretics or Schismatics; for both come under the same predicament. Heretics, refusing to be determined by the doctrinal decisions of the church, *shake off just authority*, equally with Schismatics, and are equally unjustifiable and inexcuseable.

But here the respectable author of *Thoughts, Essays, and Maxims, &c.* presents us with a most remarkable *variegation*. The *Apologist*, as we have seen, grounds the inquisitorial right of persecuting on the infallibility of the church. “But, “ says Mr. *H.* persecution in a Roman Catholic “ must be wrong, BECAUSE he asserts his church “ to be *infallible*, therefore all force or persecu- “ tion to support it by undue influence or interest “ is

“is superfluous, and tends only to compel men to
 “profess what they do not believe.” It is not
 easy to comprehend what the Gentleman means.
 He could hardly intend to banter his own church
 on her groundless pretension to infallibility. And
 yet his argument may seem to have this tendency.
 “Persecution and force in an *infallible* church is
 “superfluous,” says he. Why so? The proper
 answer is, “because such a church is and must
 “be sufficiently supported by its own infallibility,
 “and cannot be shaken or hurt by heretics or
 “gainstayers of any kind. It must stand and flou-
 “rish at all events.” This indeed is talking as
 would become a church conscious that her claim
 to infallibility was incontestable, and evident to
 the whole world. But this Gentleman must be
 very imperfectly instructed in the principles of his
 own church, if he really thinks that she proceeds
 upon this presumption. The Apologist would have
 informed him better. The idea of an infallible
 church, according to him, implies not only an
 authority, but a duty to punish schismatics, and
 those who offend by shaking off her just authority.
 These offences cannot be *justified, palliated, or*
excused; and the infallible church which should
 overlook them must be highly blameable for suf-
 fering these enormous crimes to come off with
 impunity; inasmuch as, being infallible, it is im-
 possible she should mistake either in the guilt of
 the objects, or the degree of punishment due to
 that guilt. So

So that what the respectable writer of the *Thoughts, Essays, &c.* adds, viz. that “force and “persecution tend only to make men profess what “they do not believe, — to become hypocrites, “sacrilegious,” &c. is of no kind of weight against the Apologist’s state of the case. For a man had better, according to the Apologist, be an hypocrite, a sacrilegious partaker of holy rites, or in short any thing whatever, than a *schismatic*. An hypocrite, or a sacrilegious person, bad as he may be, while he communicates with the church, is no schismatic, — does not shake off the church’s *just authority*; and, for ought that appears in the Apology, while this is the case, the hypocrisy, or the sacrilege of the conformist may be *palliated, excused, or even justified*.

Thus these Gentlemen, by dodging backwards and forwards, think fit to amuse us into a *temporary* persuasion, that intolerance is not the principle of their church; and, to make this pass the more smoothly, they have affected to appeal to the practice of Protestant churches. Where there are matters of fact to justify this appeal, it gives us concern; but we desire they will take notice that they are but *matters of fact*; — practices which are no otherwise to be justified but upon Popish principles, which all intelligent, sincere, and consistent Protestants utterly detest and abhor.

But, *in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird*, especially of a bird which hath often *escaped the*

the snare of the fowler. It is a contemptible affectation in such writers as the Apologist, to talk of charity and forbearance in the church of *Rome*, at the same time that he hath shewn, by exposing her foundations, that, in all probability, unlimited charity and forbearance, with the free and fearless exertion of the reasoning faculty, enlightened by Scripture-evidence, would not have left her one subject, such only excepted as *by her craft have had their wealth.*

However, it must be owned, these Gentlemen write after a copy of sufficient dignity to keep them in countenance. The following citation will explain my meaning, and may serve for a seasonable caution to *British* Protestants, not to pay the least regard to these strains of lenity and forbearance from writers of this complexion.

“ The maxim that he [King *James II*] set up,
 “ and about which he entertained all about him,
 “ was the great happiness of an *universal tolera-*
 “ *tion.* On this the King used to enlarge in a
 “ great variety of topics. He said, *nothing was*
 “ *more reasonable, more Christian, and more poli-*
 “ *tic ; and he reflected much on the church of Eng-*
 “ *land for the severities with which the Dissenters*
 “ *had been treated.* This, how true or just soever
 “ it might be, yet was strange doctrine in the
 “ mouth of a PROFESSED PAPIST, and of a Prince
 “ on whose account and by whose direction the
 “ church-party had been indeed but too obsequi-
 “ ously

“ ously pushed on to that rigour.” Bishop *Burnet's* Hist. of his Own Times, fol. vol. I. p. 672.

If it should be asked, how King *James II*, or any other Papist, could reconcile these professions to doctrines and practices so directly contrary to them, the same worthy Prelate hath taught us, in another work, how to account for this.

“ The *extirpation of heretics*, and the *breach*
 “ of *faith to them*, have been decreed by two of
 “ their general councils, and by a tradition of se-
 “ veral ages:—Now these opinions, as they have
 “ never been renounced by the body of that
 “ church, so indeed they cannot be, unless they
 “ renounce their *infallibility*, which is their *basis*,
 “ at the same time. Therefore, tho’ a Prince of
 “ that communion may very sincerely resolve to
 “ maintain *liberty of conscience*, and to *keep his*
 “ word, yet the blind subjection, into which he is
 “ brought by his religion, to his church, must
 “ force him to break thro’ all that, *as soon as the*
 “ doctrine of his church is opened to him, and that
 “ absolution is denied him, or higher threatenings
 “ are made him, if he continues firm to his mer-
 “ ciful inclinations.” *Reflections on a pamphlet*
entitled, Parliamentum Pacificum, in the II^d vol.
 of Bishop *Burnet's* Tracts, 4to, p. 68.

Thus we may argue with respect to this Apolo-
 gift. Suppose him to be an honest, sincere, and
 merciful man in himself, and really to mean what
 he professes in favour of toleration, yet he may
 not

not have had *all* the doctrines of his church *opened* to him; and his *justificative piece* seems to afford a presumption that he must *retract* some things in his *Apology* in order to intitle himself to *absolution*. So that, as I said, supposing him to be sincere in his own professions, opinions, and dispositions in favour of religious liberty, these can be nothing to us, unless his church would confirm them by a solemn act, repealing her former decisions, so contrary to them.

I am sorry, however, to observe that the Apologist hath left us too much room to question his *sincerity*. The honourable author of *Thoughts, &c.* appears, by some little tokens, not to have had the doctrines of his church *sufficiently opened* to him, as in the instance of his bringing the *infallibility* of the church of *Rome*, as an argument why she should *not* persecute; and therefore his opinion of the iniquity of persecution may proceed from the disposition of his own generous mind, and the light in which he hath hitherto considered these things, abstracted from the *intervention* of the church. Not so the Apologist, who plainly appears to be aware of all the consequences of admitting the *infallibility* of the church of *Rome*; to argue all along upon the supposition, or rather the *assurance*, that it is real and indisputable; and in consequence of that, amidst all his cant about charity and forbearance, laying down principles
utterly

utterly inconsistent with all possibility of an *infallible* church's admitting of *Toleration*.

Having these testimonies even from the Roman Catholics of the present day, that these pernicious principles, of *a foreign jurisdiction, superior to that of the civil government of Great Britain, and of the absolute inconsistency of all Toleration with the authority of an infallible Church*, are still among the leading maxims of that sect, the Legislature of *Great Britain*, the Patrons and Protectors of our Protestant settlement civil and religious, are fully justified in excluding Papists from all those privileges to which those citizens are intitled, who acknowledge the supremacy of the civil powers in all the departments of Government, and on that foundation pledge their faith and allegiance to them.

But when to these pernicious persuasions of the Papists we add, in the last place, their indefatigable zeal and industry in making proselytes to their church; that is, in other words, in seducing his Majesty's subjects from their allegiance; the justification of our civil governors, in providing penal laws against these disturbers of public peace and order, is complete and irrefragable.

III. And this is the third particular which remains to be explained, and in which we shall still take this Apologist for our interpreter; and begin with citing a passage from him, not a little remarkable in a writer in his circumstances.

R

“ There

“There is,” says he, “still another objection which deserves examination. It may be alledged that, if a toleration was granted to Catholics, it would be a means to spirit up their clergy to make converts; whereas, as things now stand, being overawed by penal laws, they are afraid to engage in such pursuits.” To which the Apologist makes the following curious answer: “I verily believe that more conversions are made by *Catholics under persecution*, than there would be if they were exempted from that apprehension. *Suffered to live unpersecuted*, they would be more moderate in attempts of this kind; they would be careful not to give any umbrage to the Government: but *persecuted*, they must naturally be supposed *to exert themselves in strengthening their party, in collecting force from the rigour of opposition, and in manning their hearts with fortitude*, notwithstanding the prospect of punishment.” *Apology*, p. 117, 118.

By *Catholics persecuted*, the Apologist means, Catholics under the restraint of penal laws; that is to say, Catholics in the same circumstances with the Catholics in *Great Britain and Ireland*. These Catholics, he admits, make converts, and he is not shy in telling us on what account; namely, *to strengthen their party—to collect force—and to man their hearts with fortitude*. Would you know to what end? This he likewise discovers, at page 106. “For tho’ at present they have no
“sufficient

“ sufficient force to think of making opposition—
 “ yet the advice is always good, and may be sup-
 “ ported from several testimonies of History, that
 “ no *enemy* whatever ought to be held in a con-
 “ temptible light, as *some time or other* he may
 “ find an opportunity to retaliate, and obey the
 “ dictates of REVENGE^m.”

Revenge! for what, and upon whom? Revenge
 taken upon our gracious Sovereign and the mem-
 bers and ministers of his government, for suffering
 a dirty, malicious, and abusive scribbler to insult
 and menace them in this audacious manner with
 impunity? Can this be the language of men un-

^m This saucy menace goes on thus: “ The *British* and *Irish*
 “ Catholics, tho’ helpless in themselves, claim a *fraternity* with
 “ many other very respectable bodies of men throughout *Europe*,
 “ who doubtless would resent their farther ill treatment.” It
 has often been said, that the Papists of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*
 have been and still are in a perpetual league and amity with the
 Roman Catholic powers in different parts of *Europe*, even when
 they were at war with us. But none of them ever had the front,
 before this Apologist, to avow this *claim of fraternity* in all cir-
 cumstances. It has, by the prudent part of them, been indu-
 striously concealed, and even denied, in times of war. But now
 we are informed that this resentment of these foreign *fraternities*
 remains, even at those times when no war subsists between them
 and the *British* state. May not this point at some present ex-
 pectations the Apologist may have of rousing these *fraternities* to
 take a part in the *revenge* he hath in prospect, especially if the
 holy Father should lend his hand “ to unite their power and
 “ arms, to guard the *faith*, from the attempts of its natural
 “ enemies?”

der *persecution*? Can they, who dare thus to brave the Government under whose protection they live, be under any necessity to make converts to man their hearts with fortitude? Can this be the language of men under any kind of distress, or under any the least degree of apprehension of it? For my part, I verily think the most respectable among the Roman Catholics must be ashamed of their Apologist in this instance at least; nor should I be at all surprized to hear, that these passages were among the first of those which laid the Apologist under the necessity of writing his *Justificative Piece*.

Let us now look back to the alternative. “Suffered to live unpersecuted, they would be more moderate in attempts of this kind, they would be careful not to give any umbrage to the Government.” So then the Catholics act in this affair of *profelyting* entirely upon *political* considerations. And yet is not this the very thing which in another place he most strenuously denies? “Protestants,” says he, “think it very heinous that Catholics should say, there is no saving faith but their own, and that all out of the pale of their church are damned.” *Apology*, p. 26. And this sentence, it seems, the Protestants think so heinous and uncharitable, that “they fancy, to mollify it, that the assertion must be *merely political*, in order to retain Catholics in their own communion, or gain over profelytes: but indeed it is quite

“quite the reverse,” says the Apologist, “being
 “built upon such irrefragable conclusions drawn
 “from Scripture-doctrine, that it [the *Sentence*]
 “cannot be contested.” P. 29. According to
this account, the zeal of the Roman Catholics in
 making profelytes is the pure effect of *conscience*
 and *charity*, for the salvation of souls. But, ac-
 cording to *the other*, their zeal in making profe-
 lytes is entirely a *political affair*, merely to *collect*
force, and to *strengthen their party*. Suffer them
 to live unpersecuted, and their attempts of this
 sort will be more moderate, and *conscience* and
charity will readily give way to their *care not to*
give umbrage to Government.

Let us not, however, be surprized at this. It
 is only of a piece with his representing the Roman
 Catholics of *Great Britain* and *Ireland* as in a
 state of *persecution*, even after he had said in his
 Preface, p. vi, “The Catholics have long enjoyed
 “the lenity of the Government, and are thankful
 “for it; and, as their intention is no other than
 “to demean themselves as good subjects, they
 “hope for a continuance of the same benevolent
 “disposition.”

Take the matter then which way you will;
 Papists *will*, and *judge* they *ought* to make profe-
 lytes among Protestants at all events. In a state
 of persecution, they think it *good policy*, in order
 to *collect force*, and to *strengthen their party*, that

they may, in process of time, be powerful enough to *revenge* themselves upon those who oppose them. In other circumstances, it is a matter of *charity* and *conscience*; in other words, an *indispensable duty*; and accordingly, “no church has exhibited more illustrious specimens of charity than the Catholic, in *willing* the conversion of all sinners, Jews, Mohammedans, Pagans, *Heretics*, and *Schismatics*; and in not barely *willing*, but ardently praying and *endeavouring* for the same.—Who,” says the Apologist, “have taken more painful journies, or endured greater hardships, as missionaries, to convert Infidels [the natural enemies of the Roman faith], at the hazard of their lives?” P. 26.

In perusing this Apology when it first appeared, I could not help thinking it must be the work of some conceited overweening Jesuit, who, having made some converts among us by the artifices natural to that tribe, became so exalted upon his success, as to imagine he had nothing to do but to publish his sentiments in order to captivate the whole nation at once, and bring them over not only to vote for a full toleration of Popery, but even to establish it once more as the national religion. He seems to rely much on the *supineness* and “indolent disposition of the established clergy, to instruct their flock and keep them to their duty,” p. 118; and, I dare say, takes it for granted,

granted, that both clergy and people are so sunk in ignorance of the *religious* part of the controversy, and so wholly careless and inattentive with respect to the *political*, that he might venture to put any thing upon them; and that a little plausible gilding would easily prevail with them to swallow it.

Could a man with a less degree of confidence and presumption, even with an equestrian pedigree as long as *Cadwallader's*, have had the effrontery to talk of "a scheme he hath long thought of, and
"purposes some time or other to make public,
"for effecting a salutary union between the
"church of *Rome* and the established church of
"England," impudently suggesting "that the
"church of *England* agrees in almost all the *fun-*
"damentals and essentials of faith with his sort of
"Catholics?" *Apol.* p. 119, 120ⁿ.

^a This was perhaps something more than a pretence in *Leander*, when, in the year 1634, he gave Cardinal *Barberino* an account of the several *fundamentals* and *essentials* in which the church of *England* agreed with the church of *Rome*. *State Papers* collected by *Edward Earl of Clarendon*, p. 197. I shall say nothing to the particulars enumerated by *Leander*, farther than to observe, that whatever *Protestant* company this more modern Apologist may keep, or from whomsoever he had this account of agreement in *fundamentals*, &c. he was, without peradventure, misinformed. *Leander*, after he had mentioned several circumstances in which the church of *England* of that time agreed with the church of *Rome*, says; "Abique hac Hierarchici regiminis
"formâ, existimant nostrates in Anglia Protestantes, non solum

Thus the Apologist hath saved us the trouble of proving that the Papists are as obnoxious as ever to our Protestant Government, on account of their indefatigable zeal in seducing his Majesty's subjects to the belief of the church of *Rome's infallibility*, and consequently to all the pernicious doctrines (pernicious to their plighted allegiance to their rightful Sovereign, as well as to their spiritual allegiance to Christ, who hath made them free from this yoke of bondage) depending upon it. He not only acknowledges and glories in the fact, but accounts for their success in their conversions from circumstances highly reflecting on, and, I would hope, highly injurious to, the respect-

“obscurari decus Ecclesiæ Christianæ, verum etiam ipsam ejus
 “*naturam & substantiam* tolli. Quapropter reliquas Ecclesias
 “Protestantium per *Europam* sparsas, quoniam hanc antiquissi-
 “mam Hierarchiam repudiârunt, & averfantur, revera habent
 “in numero schismaticorum.” However this might be in the days of *Leander*, it is, I will venture to say, far from being the case with the Protestants of the church of *England* at this time. Where did this Apologist learn, that the church of *England*, as now constituted, holds the foreign Protestant churches, who dissent from her form of Hierarchical Government, as *schismatics*, or as persons who, by such dissent, *obscure* and even *take away* the *nature* and *substance* of a Christian church? And how, without some authentic evidence to this purpose, will the Apologist be able to prove this agreement of the two churches in *fundamentals* and *essentials*? See *The Life of Bishop Kennet*, p. 111—127. One might appeal to authorities less moderate in church matters than *Bishop Kennet*, and even to some mentioned by the Apologist himself.

able

able clergy of the established church; which those *Protestant* writers, who have represented the late complaints of the increase of Popery among us as the effect of *groundless clamour*, and *sinister views*, rather than of any real conviction of the matter of fact, would do well to consider.

How the case really stands with respect to the numbers converted to Popery of late years, I will not pretend to pronounce. Intelligence of this kind may probably be had, in no long time, from the highest authority in the kingdom. But this I will venture to say, upon the testimony of this Apology, and some other late performances from the same quarter, and penned in the same spirit, that in no period since the Revolution hath Popery appeared so open and barefaced, and with such audacious insults and abuses of the Protestant Reformation, as within the compass of the last two or three years. And, if this increased confidence of the Papists is not to be ascribed to their increased numbers, I am afraid we shall be driven to account for it by circumstances still more alarming to the real friends of our Protestant settlement, and to the religious and civil liberties of this country, which must stand or fall with it.

Perhaps a cursory view of the *management* of our Apologist may give us a little light into *one* of these circumstances at least.

In his *Apology* he makes it his business to *trim* as dextrously as he can, between the Papists and
the

the Protestants, upon what he calls “ Two capital
 “ points: First, the attachment of the Papists to
 “ the banished *Stuart* family; secondly, their ac-
 “ knowledgement of a power in the Pope, which
 “ is inconsistent with the laws of this realm.” *Apol.*
 p. 107.

In a little time, however, that is to say, in as
 little a time as his *fraternity* could take in reading
 and judging of the contents of his pamphlet, we
 find the writer under a necessity of sending after
 his Apology a *Justificative Piece*; the occasion of
 which is pretended to be, that “ the Catholic no-
 “ bility of this realm have expressed great dis-
 “ pleasure that an *obscure* author should presume
 “ to make an *Apology* for them, being fully suffi-
 “ cient themselves, if they found it needful, to
 “ petition in a body his Majesty and his Parlia-
 “ liament for a mitigation of grievances,” p. 176.

It is natural here to ask, why the Roman Ca-
 tholic Nobility did not express their displeasure
 against *some other* late advocates for the mitigation
 of their grievances, who, for aught the public
 knew of them, were equally *obscure* with our
 Apologist? And then again, if the Roman Catho-
 lic Nobility were displeased with the Apology,
solely on the account of the *obscurity* of the
 author, that objection seems to have been suffi-
 ciently obviated by the very honourable pedigree
 the Apologist hath exhibited, by which he seems
 to set himself on a level with the best blood,
 Catholic

Catholic or Protestant, in the kingdom. What occasion to extend his *justification* to any other topics, if the forward officiousness of an *obscure* writer had been the only objection to this Apologist?

The very nature of the case then leads us to suspect that the *displeased* Roman Catholics had some cause to be discontented with the Apology, besides the *obscurity* of the writer; and the principal subject of the *Justificative Piece* points out, even with certainty, the cause of offence.

He had played his part, it seems, on the subject of the pontifical powers, with sufficient skill and artifice to amuse the Protestants with what he *appeared* to give up, at the same time that he saved the honour and obligation of the Roman Catholics, by the extensive advantages he still reserved to his Holiness.

But when he came to touch upon the attachment of the Roman Catholics to the house of *Stuart*, the poor Gentleman had worse luck, and undertook a little too hastily, that “the *British*”
 “and *Irish* Catholics have long been disused to
 “consider, *with High-churchmen*, as things not to
 “be contested, the notions of hereditary and in-
 “alienable right, divine right, passive obedience
 “and non-resistance.” *Apol.* p. 107.

The *British* and *Irish* Roman Catholics could not but be sensible that the High-churchmen must take it grievously amiss that they were thus left
 in

in the lurch by those upon whose natural attachment to the *Stuart* family they had the greatest reason to rely. Some of these High-churchmen too might be too considerable to be thus deserted by those who had continued to give them assurances all along of their being prepared to assist upon all exigencies. And as the *Justificative Piece* is almost wholly taken up in making the best of this mistake, we learn from it, that the *obscurity* of the author was far from being the only reason that offence and displeasure was taken at the Apologist by the *British* and *Irish* Catholics.

Let us now see with what grace and dexterity he makes the *amende honorable* in his *Justificative Piece*. In his Apology above quoted, he represents the *British* and *Irish* Catholics as being convinced that the notion of divine hereditary right was no longer defensible, and consequently that they had laid it aside upon *principle* and *conviction* that the *British* Parliament had a right to dispose of the Crown first to King *William*, and afterwards to the House of *Hanover*. But finding, by the *displeasure* of the *English* Catholics, that he had herein engaged for more than he could make good, he endeavours to come off by intimating that if they had not *disused* themselves to consider the notion of the *hereditary* and *unalienable* right of the House of *Stuart* as incontestable upon *principle*, they ought to have done it in *good policy*.

“ He

“He has not,” he says, “in the least any view
 “to cast the least odium upon the House of *Stuart*.
 “The name deserves to be revered, were it for
 “no other reason than its mingling with the blood
 “of the most illustrious Potentates of *Europe*,”—
 p. 185. “From whence,” he says, “the intention
 “of the author [of the Apology] has been all
 “along plain and obvious, being calculated to
 “*demonstrate*, that, upon an unprejudiced review
 “of all circumstances, it is MUCH MORE ADVISE-
 “ABLE for the Catholics to covet subjection to
 “the House of *Hanover*, as by law established,
 “even in a state of persecution, than to the House
 “of *Stuart*.—And of this,” he tells us, “all the
 “Catholics, whether *British* or *Irish*, seem now
 “conscious to themselves, NOT BECAUSE THEIR
 “HOPE OF A POPISH PRETENDER ARE EXTIN-
 “GUISHED, but because they clearly see the
 “tranquillity of undisturbed life connected with it.
 “For indeed,” continues he, “if any are so fan-
 “ciful as to foster the hopes of a Pretender, *they*
 “may still do it as much as ever. It appears by
 “*M^r Allester’s* Letters, not long since published,
 “that the Pretender, though apparently disavowed
 “by *France*, was the animating spring last war of
 “all their secret schemes against *England*.” *Justi-*
ficative Piece, p. 186.

By this detail it is clear he found that the con-
 sciences of the *English* and *Irish* Catholics were
 not so *pliable* on this head, of the divine heredi-
 tary

tary right of the House of *Stuart*, as he had pretended. It is probable they gave him to understand, that, after all his flourishes in the Apology, the *British* and *Irish* Catholics, where the *divine right* intervened, had no better opinion of a parliamentary head of the state than of a parliamentary head of the church. He was obliged, therefore, to compromise matters with them, to leave them their veneration for the House of *Stuart* undisturbed; to grant that their hopes of a Popish Pretender might not be extinguished, that they might still foster those hopes; for that the *French* (one of those respectable bodies of men with whom the Papists of *Great Britain* and *Ireland* claim a fraternity), though they apparently disavowed the Pretender, yet made use of him during the last war as the animating spring of all their secret schemes against *England*. His intention, therefore, he tells them, was only to suggest to them what was *adviseable* in the present exigency — that he took the hint from their seeming acquiescence and tranquillity under the present Government, and consequently might be excuseable in supposing that this might proceed from a *consciousness* that the title of the House of *Hanover* was preferable to that of the House of *Stuart*.

What effect this *dodging* justification may have towards procuring absolution for this Apologist, one cannot say, nor probably shall we ever know.

But

But I must own I am far from thinking it will give satisfaction to our *Jure-divino* High-churchmen. For that circumstance of a *seeming consciousness* of the expediency of subjection to the House of *Hanover* in the *British* and *Irish* Papists, may naturally enough suggest a jealousy in the said High-churchmen, that these their ancient allies are meditating a *defection* from their common principle, unless the Roman Catholics can convince them that the Apologist is wholly uncommissioned to declare their sense upon this delicate article, and that he hath actually been put to his penance for this presumption.

In the mean time we are let into an interesting secret; namely, that the body of the Roman Catholics of *Great Britain* and *Ireland* remain still unsatisfied with the parliamentary title of the House of *Hanover*. Why else is this point so much laboured by this writer in his *Justificative Piece*, after his repeated endeavours to adjust it to the taste of those Catholics in his *Apology*? Nor indeed is this all we learn. The *Justificative Piece* informs us, that the Apologist's Fellow-catholics are in no disposition to forego their hopes of the restoration of a Popish Pretender; and that, whatever countenance the *French* may occasionally put on, they may, at the bottom, be depended upon whenever the Pretender may be made use of to promote their secret schemes upon *England*.— And indeed, suppose the *French* not to be in earnest

nest with respect to any real design of advancing the Pretender to the *British* throne, what are we to judge of their making this *occasional* use of him? Of himself he hath no power, no forces, no money to pay them, which are all necessary articles to make him a valuable ally to the *French*. The alternative is, that he hath a strong party among the Papists and High-churchmen in *England*, who, while they can be amused with hopes that the Pretender's interests are forwarding, will readily concur with the *French*, or any other *fraternal* power in *Europe*, in their secret schemes against the present Government of this country.

I will not inquire how far the Apologist himself may or may not be in earnest in giving this detail of his political principles, or how sincere he may be in ascribing to the *British* Legislature the sole power of disposing of the *British* Crown. He hath sufficiently discovered that the *British* and *Irish* Catholics in general do not think as he pretends to do; and he hath drop'd one intimation, that they will never quit the *hope* that *some* Pretender may one day relieve their distresses.

“Hope,” says he, “how vain soever, is the
 “last smiling solace that quits a man, before he
 “resigns his breath. As a balsam to his woes,
 “he will figure to himself that the hand which
 “was the cause of his being depressed, might
 “again be instrumental towards lifting him up :

“so

“ so that a Pretender will never be wanting to
 “ those who chuse to create one, tho’ every one
 “ of the House of *Stuart* was as extinct in life as
 “ in law to the people of *Great Britain* and *Ire-*
 “ *land.*” *Justif. Piece*, p. 186, 187.

It is not easy to understand how they who hope that the hand which was the cause of the Roman Catholics being depressed, if the hand of a *Stuart* is here meant, should be again instrumental in lifting them up, notwithstanding every one of the House of *Stuart* should be extinct. Undoubtedly this is meant of the *British* and *Irish* Papists, of whose *depression* one or more of the House of *Stuart* was certainly the cause. But, if the whole House of *Stuart* were utterly extinct, how is it possible the same hand should be instrumental in lifting them up, which was the cause of depressing them? That the *British* and *Irish* Catholics would never be without a Popish Pretender to oppose to a Protestant Sovereign, is credible enough; but it is neither kind nor politic in the Apologist to be so forward to apprize us of this disposition in the *faithful*, even though this intelligence might be in some measure necessary to his *justification*. The Roman Catholics and the *High-churchmen*, who are attached to the Pretender’s title, alledge a reason of *conscience* for it; and, while we can suppose them sincere, we have compassion for their being misled into so many inconveniences by a false principle, at the same time

that we are obliged to restrain them from doing mischief with it. But if, as the Apologist represents them, they *will* have a Pretender at all adventures, whether a *Stuart* or not, we are sure that conscience can have nothing to do in a determination of that sort; and, if there was no other reason to be thought of, *that* alone would be sufficient to exclude such desperadoes from any toleration in a free Protestant Government °.

° It is remarkable that, while some of the *Apologist's* sort of High-churchmen have been embellishing their *Idol-adventurer* in the public prints with every human virtue, and reproaching the Pope for treating him with so little respect to the character he assumes, the Popish pleaders for Toleration have been as diligent in assuring us of his *insignificance*; perfectly ridiculing his pretensions to regal honours without the countenance of his Holiness, which, it seems, he is no longer to expect. They who remember in what style the Roman Catholics talked in the Father's life-time, are much surprized at this sudden turn. But others (some of whom pretend to have made observations on the spot) think all this very accountable. “ The *Romans*, say they, “ have been convinced for some time, that, considering the “ slender personal merit of the elder brother, and the devotional “ attachments of the younger, there is no probability that this “ branch of the House of *Stuart* will be farther propagated. So “ far therefore as the conquest over the *Northern Heresy* may be “ supposed to depend upon these two brothers, the prospect must “ be extremely short and indistinct. On which consideration, “ it is conjectured, the *Roman* system with respect to *Great Britain* and *Ireland* hath undergone a revolution; and that, “ passing by the pretensions of their present inmates, on account “ of *the defect in their genealogy*, the *Romans* are now looking “ forward to a *Catholic Pretender* beyond them. History informs us, that, in the year 1701, the Duchess of *Savoy* tendered
Upon

Upon the whole, had not this *Justificative Piece* followed so close upon the heels of the *Apology*, I should have been inclined to come over to the

“ a Protestation, by the hands of Count *Maffei*, against the Bill
 “ for the *Hanover* Succession, then depending in Parliament;
 “ in which, taking no notice of the late Chevalier, she claimed
 “ immediately after the then Princess ANNE of DENMARK, and
 “ thereby, says one of our Historians, *appeared to confirm the just*
 “ *suspensions of that Pretender's birth.* Tindal, *Contin. of Rapin*,
 “ 8vo, 1758, vol. III. p. 95. This incident the court of Rome
 “ is now supposed to have in its eye; and, as the Roman Ca-
 “ tholics of this country have always taken their political cue from
 “ thence, it is probable enough that the strain in which they have
 “ lately talked, may be the effect of the fresh intelligence they
 “ have received from that quarter. In the mean time, tho' the
 “ High-churchmen may not have been so early apprized of this
 “ alteration, there is little doubt of their closing with it, as they
 “ may be furnished from History with an instance where their
 “ forefathers were disposed to make a like transfer of their loy-
 “ alty, upon certain conditions. *Some of them*, according to
 “ *Lamberti*, came to the Count de Briançon, and proposed to him, that
 “ the Duke of Savoy should deliver up one of his sons to be educated
 “ in England in the Protestant religion; declaring that, in that
 “ case, the Act for the Hanover succession should never pass. But
 “ the Duke refused to consent to it. Tindal, u. s. p. 94. There
 “ are, besides this, other considerations tending to dispose both
 “ Roman Catholics and *Jure-divino* men to acquiesce in the
 “ supposed decision of the Roman court. They may both cul-
 “ tivate their new connexions with less suspicion, and, what is
 “ of more immediate consequence to their present emolument,
 “ both will undoubtedly be relieved from the burden of certain
 “ contributions which must on many occasions have embarrassed
 “ their private affairs. For the Holy Congregation, having
 “ once canonically determined against the *legitimacy* of the pre-
 “ sent claimant, tho' charity and compassion may incline the

S 2

opinion

opinion of those who have conjectured that the *Apology* was the work of some determined enemy to the Roman Catholics of *Great Britain* and *Ire-*

“*Romans* and others to support him with a decent, and even
“honourable provision, on account of his relation to a person
“so highly distinguished by them as the Father, yet there can
“be no obligation upon them to continue *princely appointments*
“to the Son, whom, *upon their receiving new lights, with respect*
“*to the foundation of his pretensions*, they no longer judge to
“have any just demand of that kind upon them.” Thus far
some of our travelling politicians, whose surmises on this head
must be left to time to falsify or confirm, as it shall happen. It
often falls out, however, that speculations of this kind, wild and
extravagant as they may appear to some, are attended with facts
and circumstances, not otherwise out of the common course of
things, which give them an air of high probability. Some late
occurrences at home and abroad, which I forbear to mention,
because they are under every one’s eye, seem to be of this sort,
with respect to the matter in question. One cannot positively
say, whether our Apologist might not hint at this new scheme,
in telling us, *a Pretender will never be wanting to those who*
chuse to create one. This looks at least as if his Fellow-catholics
and their coadjutors have a Pretender in contemplation, exclusive
of the two brothers. If so, no doubt but the Apologist will be
understood by the Fraternity; to whom a public intimation of
that kind cannot be very agreeable, as it may not yet be time
to have a secret of that importance divulged; in which case we
may shortly expect another *Justificative Piece*, to explain and vin-
dicate the doctrines and assertions of the first. In perusing a late
account of the manners and customs of *Italy* written by Mr.
Baretti, I could not help remarking that, though the author is
unmercifully severe, and sometimes with very little reason, upon
Mr. *Sharp*, he takes not the least notice of Mr. *Sharp’s* account
of the Pretender’s superstitious bigotry, nor of his interesting re-
flection upon it, tho’ the said Mr. *Baretti*, upon other occasions,

land,

land, who thought fit to expose them to the resentment and contempt of the *English* Protestants, by offering so many gross affronts to their national

is not sparing either of his sarcasms on the *English* religion and government, or of his apologies, such as they are, for the most abject and ridiculous superstitions of his countrymen in general. We may be pretty sure, by these circumstances, that he did not desert the patronage of the Pretender out of compliment to *England*. Shall we account for his silence by saying, that he is a *Piedmontese*, and chuses to adhere to the *Protestation* of the *Duchess of Savoy*, even at this late hour? In such a case, it will be no wonder that he should not think himself concerned for the reputation of the late Chevalier's son, whom, I think, he himself somewhere calls *The Pretender*, and whom, upon the supposition abovementioned, he must consider in *that* light, without any respect had to his competition for the *British* crown with the illustrious family in possession of it. For my own part, I cannot but hope that Mr. *Sharp* will at some time make his defence against this petulant critic. A very superficial reader may see he hath laid himself open to severe retaliation; and a proper expostulation upon his remarkable silence on a point which hath heretofore made the Roman Catholics of this country so *sore*, and on which they might have expected some amends from an *Italian* writer, to whom the object of Mr. *Sharp's* reflections could not be wholly unknown, may probably end in a discovery that Mr. *Baretti*, by waving this *once* interesting subject at this time, did not pay less regard to the present taste of his *English* friends, than they who on *former occasions* have exhausted their rhetoric in encomiums on the late Pretender and his family, when they were the fashionable objects of the predominant passion among the Papists and High-churchmen of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*. But, whatever may be thought of these speculations on account of their *novelty*, I cannot but think them of importance to the public, and worthy of an accurate examination. A due attention to the remotest circumstances, even such as are within a bare possi-

establishment, and advancing so many absurdities and contradictions on the behalf of his own pretended party. The *Justificative Piece* leaves no farther room for these surmises. The obscurity of the author hath not prevented his being discovered by the Roman Catholics, who have, with bility of affecting our invaluable constitution, as it depends upon the parliamentary settlement of the crown, is no more than we owe to our sovereign, ourselves, and our posterity. When matters are come to that pass, that a Popish writer hath the impudence to propose an union of the church of *England* with the church of *Rome*, *with which the See of Rome will have reason to be well pleased and contented*, what a train of reflections is suggested to a thinking *English* Protestant? What do these people mean? Do they expect that our gracious King, and his well-affected subjects, will come into the proposal? They can hardly be so mad. Is this union then proposed in pursuance of the compromise offered to the Count *de Briancón*? One cannot tell. Perhaps the Apologist may think that the *Protestant religion* of those who made the offer to the Count, and his own *scheme of union*, may not be materially different the one from the other; and perhaps he may think right. But if he thinks, by his scheme of religious union, to make way for the political project, what must he think of our loyalty to the House of *Hanover*? It is not to be imagined that such a writer should have the countenance of any one who is able to protect him from the just indignation of an insulted Protestant people. But it is just bad enough with us, if he derives his encouragement from any well-grounded observation that the indifference of some, and the unfriendliness of others, who call themselves Protestants, to the principles of civil and religious liberty, together with the inattention of still more, to the encroaching and exterminating nature of Popery, may leave room for the full impression of his pernicious documents, without the danger of incurring the resentment of the public in any degree.

good

good reason, expressed their displeasure at the folly and presumption of a private man of their own persuasion thus taking upon him, without any commission, to answer for the whole body in points which so nearly concern the connexion and consistency of their whole system. And now that the Apologist hath presented us with so respectable and brilliant an account of his family, he cannot long be concealed from any one who has the curiosity to inquire after him.

Some people, I find, have thought, since the publication of the *Justificative Piece*, that the discovery of the writer of the Apology might answer a more important end than barely gratifying the curiosity of some particular persons. "It is plain, say they, from this attempt to justify himself, that he hath had no countenance from the Roman Catholics; but is it possible a man should have the impudence to propose to an established Protestant church a scheme of union with the church of *Rome*, without some countenance or encouragement from some other quarter? And might it not be of some use to the public to discover the man, for the sake of learning what are his connexions, and what company he keeps of another sort?"

For my part, I think this a matter of no great consequence, at least till the man shall have exhibited his curious scheme of *reconciliation*. I trust, the Protestants of *Great Britain* and *Ireland* are

in no present disposition to come into *any* project of union with the church of *Rome*; and, even though we should suppose the Apologist to have concerted his plan with the most bigoted High-churchmen in the kingdom, there are particular reasons to believe that the Papists in general would have objections to it, which will for ever prevent its admission among them. Nothing, I am persuaded, will satisfy them, but the establishment of their system, with all its despotic pretensions^p; and to accomplish this they ever have been and ever will be at work, and employ all their craft and artifice for that purpose, upon all occasions and opportunities.

I have been assured upon good authority, that none of the Popish Casuists are of more esteem with the Roman Catholics of this kingdom than *Bellarmino*, upon account of the *convenience* of so

^p “The Papists in *England* must have a King of their own, a Pope, that must do something in our kingdom; therefore there is no reason they should enjoy the same privileges” [which the Protestants in *France* enjoyed at that time, viz. of bearing office in the state, &c]. *Selden’s Table-Talk*, p. 129. The Pope still claims the same *Kingship* in *Great Britain* and *Ireland* as ever, as appears by the publication of the Bull *In cœna Domini* every year on *Mundy-Thursday* at *Rome*; a short account of which may be seen in *Borwer’s Hist. of the Popes*, vol. VII. p. 465. Will the Papists of *Great Britain* and *Ireland* give us any security that they disavow the doctrines of this Bull? or will they chuse to insinuate, with the Apologist, p. 141, that a claim solemnly and religiously published annually by *all* Popes, “was only arrogated by *some* Popes in former times?”

many

many of his *solutions* to Catholics situated in an heretical country. He is indeed their *Oracle*. But *Bellarmino* hath inculcated the Duty of destroying Heretics in the strongest terms; and only dispenses with it in cases where the Catholics are *too few* or *too weak* to attempt it^a. The advantages therefore that the Protestants give to people thus principled, which may contribute either to their strength or the increase of their numbers, are just so many steps towards the destruction of our constitution.

The History of the Polish Dissidents could never have been published at a more seasonable time than when the Papists are soliciting an enlargement of their civil and religious privileges in this country, on the pretence of their being so *few*. We there find the Roman Catholics and Dissidents of *Poland* were once nearly equal as to numbers. We learn from it the stipulations between the two parties, and by what solemn decisions their civil and religious rights were secured to the Dissidents upon various occasions; but all to no purpose, when they who called themselves Catholics had increased their numbers, and had got the power into their hands. The maxim that *no faith is to be kept with Heretics*, was never more visibly nor canonically executed, from the time that it had the sacred sanction of the Council of *Constance*. No

^a *Bellarmino*, de Laicis, *Lib. III. cap. 22.*

artifice,

artifice, no injustice, no violence was omitted, whereby the Dissidents might be dispossessed of their churches, and restrained in the exercise of their religion. And what has happened in the course of the late struggles, by which the Dissidents have endeavoured to reinstate themselves in their natural and legal rights and privileges, makes it evident to demonstration, that THE SPIRIT OF POPERY IS STILL THE SAME, irreconcilable in its hatred and enmity to all Dissenters from it; bigoted to the most abject superstitions of the darkest ages, and determined against every degree of toleration, wherever it has the power to enforce its sanguinary decrees against those whom it thinks fit to stigmatize with the name of Heretics.

After all, though it is impossible to see what security the Papists of *Great Britain and Ireland* can give to a Protestant Government for their dutiful subjection to it, more especially along with that absolute deference they pay to the Pope, if we take it even upon the terms stated by the *Apolo-
gist* (in which, it should seem, he has gone far below any authority he has from his Fellow-catholics)—though, I say, it is impossible to see this from any proposals that have been offered by the various writers who have pleaded their cause within the last two or three years, yet, if any means could be found which might insure the public safety against the treasonable, exterminat-
ing

ing principles of their religion, and at the same time permit them the free and unmolested exercise of their worship, they would not find an advocate more ready to plead their cause than myself.

Some plans of this kind have not long ago appeared in the News-papers, which might seem to deserve the consideration of the public, if the answers to them, and the remarks upon them by Popish writers in the same papers, had not betrayed the utter aversion of the whole party to the necessary limitations there proposed, and indeed to any limitations upon the busy pragmatical spirit of their priests, and other emissaries, ever upon the watch to seize all opportunities of carrying on the grand work of *proselyting*, and thereby promoting disaffection to our established religion and government, in the prospect of gaining that by *power* and *force*, which, I trust, they will never be able to compass by *treaty* and *negotiation*.

ADDENDUM

ADDENDUM to P. 90.

I Have at length met with *Arnauld's Apologie pour les Catholiques*, where his misrepresentation of Sir Robert Southwell's testimony given at *Coleman's Trial*, appears pag. 224, and makes a part of his fourth proof of *Coleman's* innocence. He there not only treats Sir Robert with marks of contempt, calling him "a certain Robert Southwell, &c." but says, that he gave an account of some particulars in *Oates's* testimony before the Council, which *Oates* himself said he had not given. And, in order to make Sir Robert's evidence appear inconsistent with itself, he totally omits Sir Robert's Answer to the Lord Chief Justice's last interrogatory, where Sir Robert fully establishes his own credit, as well as that of *Oates*, with respect to the particular in question; as may be seen in *Coleman's Trial*, printed in 1678, pag. 39, 40. As I have not seen that Edition of the *Apologie*, in which Sir Robert Southwell's letter to Mr. *Arnauld*, together with Mr. *Arnauld's* answer and acknowledgment, are printed, I cannot give the particulars. But what *Arnauld's* Biographer says

of this affair is to this effect: “ Mr. *Arnauld* be-
 “ ing mistaken, in refuting the romance of this
 “ conspiracy, in a fact, which wounded the honour
 “ of Sir *Robert Southwell*, an *English* Protestant,
 “ some time Secretary to the Council of his *Bri-*
 “ *tannic* Majesty, he [*Arnauld*] was no sooner
 “ apprized of it, than he made a public retracta-
 “ tion, and carried the satisfaction, which he there
 “ gave to Sir *Robert Southwell*, much farther than
 “ Sir *Robert* himself desired. This retraction
 “ may be seen printed by way of Addition to the
 “ first part of his Apology for the Catholics. Mr.
 “ *Arnauld*, in this rencounter, had the consolation
 “ to learn from Sir *Robert Southwell* himself, that
 “ his *Britannic* Majesty (then Duke of *York*),
 “ having been informed of this mistake, had the
 “ goodness to excuse this Doctor [*Arnauld*], and
 “ to be willing to become surety for his good
 “ faith, and for the pleasure with which he would
 “ address himself to repair his fault; his Majesty
 “ having said to Mr. *Southwell*, that Mr. *Arnauld*,
 “ being a stranger, had not been able to distinguish
 “ true advices from such as were false; but that,
 “ being a person so esteemed for his learning and
 “ probity, he could not but rejoice at being unde-
 “ ceived, and would with pleasure give all the sa-
 “ tisfaction in this matter which should be required
 “ of him. His *Britannic* Majesty, having learned
 “ afterwards in what manner Mr. *Arnauld* had
 “ made reparation for his fault, had the goodness
 “ to

“ to desire to see the letter he had written to Mr.
“ *Southwell*; and, after having kept it a whole
“ day, said, in returning it to Sir *Robert*, that it
“ *was a very handsome letter, and such a one as*
“ *might be expected from Mr. Arnauld.*” *Histoire*
Abrégée de la Vie, & des Ouvrages de Mr. Ar-
nauld, à Cologne, 1695, p. 187. The truth is,
Arnauld was no more able to distinguish true in-
telligence from false in *other* cases, than he was
in this of Sir *Robert Southwell*. Had some of the
witnesses, upon whose testimony he hath descanted,
been of equal quality with Sir *Robert Southwell*,
and had expostulated with him in the same spirit
on his misrepresentations of their evidence, *Arnauld*
might have had the additional *pleasure* of retract-
ing the far greater part of what he wrote con-
cerning the Popish Plot, as may be seen by com-
paring his *Apology* with the printed Trials of *Cole-*
man, Stafford, &c. The Duke of *York*’s observa-
tion, concerning *Arnauld*’s inability to distinguish
true advices from *false*, is very just, and the more
to be remarked, as it is highly probable that *Ar-*
nauld had all his intelligence concerning the Plot,
true or false, from his Royal Highness’s favourites
and implements. This trash the Papists of the
present times are now bringing back, by way of
discrediting the Popish Plot, and opposing to our
public records the dreams of foreigners, founded
on

on the fabulous intelligence conveyed by their forefathers to such zealots as *Arnauld*, whose reputation, they hoped, in after-times, might tend to make their wicked and desperate machinations incredible to posterity. With these kind of *Apologies* the Protestants of the present times may be duped if they please, without looking back to their own authentic records, which, however, it would be adviseable for them to do. For, as a candid and judicious lawyer of those times has observed, "That which gave credit to the Popish Plot, was, *writings*, concurring with oral testimony. For," adds he, "very little of the truth of the Popish Plot depended on the credit of *Oates*, *Bedloe*, or any other person; most of the facts of that design, when discovered, proving themselves." *Hawles's* Remarks on several Trials, fol. 1689, p. 4. As I have *Arnauld's* Apology before me, I will just mention, that I learn from it, that the Jesuit *La Colombiere*, Almoner to the Dukes of *York*, and the person by whose means *The Devotion to the Sacred Heart*, &c. abovementioned, was revived, was accused of having a hand in the Popish Plot, and, in consequence of that charge, which consisted of six articles, imprisoned. What was the event, Mr. *Arnauld* could give no account; nor is it at all to

my

my purpose to inquire into his guilt, farther than to observe, that the fifth article of his charge was, that *he had the care of a convent of religious females, secreted in London.* A circumstance which shews the adaption of his talents to practise upon a poor visionary Nun, in the gross manner pretty plainly suggested in the Narrative above exhibited.

ADDITIONAL EXTRACTS.

ANECDOTE from Mr. Selden's *Table-Talk*,
under the Word POPE, p. 129.

“THE Papists call our religion a Parlia-
mentary religion. But there was once, I
am sure, a Parliamentary Pope. Pope URBAN
[VI] was made Pope in *England*, by Act of
Parliament, against Pope CLEMENT [VII]. The
Act is not in the Book of Statutes, either be-
cause he that compiled the Book would not
have the name of Pope there, or else he would
not let it appear that they meddled with any
such thing. But 'tis upon the Rolls.”

A learned Antiquary, and worthy Divine of the
church of *England*, whose name I am not at liberty
to mention, being desirous to have this curious
fact verified and authenticated by the record it-
self, applied to the late *George Holmes*, Esq; Keeper
of the Records in the Tower of *London*, by whose
permission and assistance he transcribed the Act as
follows, out of the Statute Roll of the 2d year of
King *Richard II.*

T

“ Item

“ Item pur ceo qe nostre Seigneur le Roy ad
“ entenduz sibien par certeyns lettres patentes
“ nouvellement venuz de certains Cardinalx rebelx
“ contre nostre Saint Piere URBAN a ore Pape come
“ autrement par comon fame qe division et discord
“ estoit parentre nostre dit Saint Piere et les ditz
“ Cardinalx la quex safforcent a tout leur poiar a
“ deposer nostre dit Seint Piere de l'estat de Pape
“ et de exciter et commover per leur mesmes *uraies*
“ fuggestions les Rois Princes et le peuple Chri-
“ stien en contre luy a grant peril de leur Almes
“ et a tres male example. Nostre dit Seigneur le
“ Roy fist monster les dites Lettres a Prelates
“ Seigneurs et autrez grantz et sages de son Roialme
“ esteantz au dit Parliament et veues et entenduz
“ les Lettres avandites et evemeure deliberation
“ sur la matier estoit par le ditz Prelates pronun-
“ ziez et publiez par plusors grandez et notable
“ raisons illoeques montrez en plein Parliament
“ sibien par matier trove en dites Lettres come
“ autrement qe le dit URBAN estoit duement esluz
“ en Pape et qe ensy est il et doit estre verrai Pape
“ et le come Pape et chief de Seint Esglise l'en
“ doit accepter et obeir et a ceo fair saccorderent
“ toutes lez Prelats Seigneurs et Commons en le
“ Parliament avandit. Et en aultre est assentuz
“ qe toutes les Benefices et autres Possessions qe les
“ ditz Cardinalx rebellantz et toutz autres leur
“ coadjutours fautors adherentz ou aucuns autres
“ enemies de nostre dit Seigneur le Roi et de son
“ Roialme

“ Roialme ont deniz [f. deinz] le poair notre dit
 “ Seigneur le Roi soient seizez es mains de mesme
 “ notre Seigneur le Roi et qe notre Seigneur le Roi
 “ soit responduz des fruites et profites de mesmes
 “ Benefices et Possessions tant come ils demouront
 “ en ses mains par le cause avantdit. Et auxint
 “ est ordenez qe si aucun liege de Roi ou autre
 “ deinz son poair purchase Provision Benefice ou
 “ autre Grace daucun par noun de Pape qe de le
 “ dit notre Saint Piere URBAN ou soit obeisant a
 “ aucun autre persone come a Pape soit mys hors
 “ de la protection de notre Seigneur le Roi et les
 “ biens et chateuz seizes come forfaites.”

In English thus.

“ Also because our Lord the King hath under-
 “ stood, as well by certain Letters Patent lately
 “ come from certain Cardinals rebels against our
 “ Holy Father *Urban* at this time Pope, as other-
 “ wise by common fame, that division and discord
 “ have arisen between our said holy Father and
 “ the said Cardinals, who labour with all their
 “ might to depose our said holy Father from the
 “ estate of Pope, and to provoke and stir up
 “ against him Kings, Princes, and Christian peo-
 “ ple, by their own *mere* suggestions, to the great
 “ peril of their souls, and setting an evil example
 “ to others; our said Lord the King caused the
 “ said Letters to be shewn to the Prelates, Lords,
 “ and other Grandees and Sages of his kingdom,

“ being at the said Parliament. And the Letters
 “ aforesaid being seen and understood, and mature
 “ deliberation had upon the matter, it was by the
 “ said Prelates declared and for many great and
 “ notable reasons there shewn in full Parliament,
 “ as well from the contents of the said Letters as
 “ otherwise, that the said *Urban* was duly elected
 “ Pope, and so is and ought to be true Pope, and
 “ as Pope, and Head of holy Church, he ought
 “ to be received and obeyed; and to do this the
 “ Prelates, Lords, and Commons in the Parliament
 “ before-mentioned agree. And moreover it is
 “ agreed, that all the Benefices and other Posses-
 “ sions, which the said rebellious Cardinals, and
 “ all others their coadjutors, fautors, adherents,
 “ and any other enemies of our said Lord the
 “ King and of his kingdom, have within the jurif-
 “ diction of our said Lord the King, shall be seized
 “ into the hands of the same our Lord the King;
 “ and that our Lord the King shall be accountable
 “ for the fruits and profits of the same Benefices
 “ and Possessions, so long as they shall remain in
 “ his hands, for the cause before-mentioned. And
 “ furthermore it is enacted, that if any liegeman
 “ of the King, or any other within his jurisdiction,
 “ shall purchase any Provision, Benefice, or any
 “ other grace, of any person by the name of Pope,
 “ save of our said holy Father *Urban*, or shall
 “ yield obedience to any other person as Pope, he
 “ shall be put out of the protection of our Lord
 “ the

“the King, and his goods and chattels seized as
“forfeited.”

Perhaps it may not be unacceptable to the reader, to see a short account of this Pope *Urban* and these *rebellious* Cardinals, and of the motives which disposed King *Richard* II and his Parliament to take this extraordinary step in favour of *Urban*, from *Rapin's* History of *England*.

“*Gregory* XI, having left *Avignon*, on account
“of certain pretended revelations, in order to
“go and reside at *Rome*, died *March* 7th, 1378.
“Of the three and twenty Cardinals then in be-
“ing, six staid at *Avignon*, one was gone upon a
“legateship, and the sixteen others, of whom
“twelve were *Frenchmen*, and four *Italians*,
“were at *Rome* when *Gregory* died. These Car-
“dinals being assembled in the Conclave, in order
“to proceed to the election of a Pope, were in
“great perplexity. Their intent was to chuse a
“*Frenchman*; but, as they foresaw the people of
“*Rome* would be against it, they resolved to give
“them a seeming satisfaction, by pretending to
“elect an *Italian*. But they agreed among them-
“selves beforehand, that, as soon as they could
“act with freedom, they would chuse another
“who should be the true Pope; a project which
“could hardly fail of begetting a schism. Ac-
“cording to their agreement, of which we could
“have no certainty but by their own confession,
“they

“ they elected the Archbishop of *Bari*, a *Neapo-*
 “ *litan*, who assumed the name of *Urban VI*. The
 “ election was notified to all Christian Princes as
 “ canonical by the Cardinals themselves the Elect-
 “ ors, and for some time they themselves acknow-
 “ ledged *Urban* as Head of the Church. Not-
 “ withstanding, whether in pursuance of their
 “ agreement, or whether, as some affirm, on the
 “ score of *Urban’s* treating them with too great
 “ haughtiness, these same Cardinals met at *Ana-*
 “ *gnia*, and elected one of the Cardinals of *Avignon*,
 “ who stiled himself *Clement VII*. These two
 “ elections by the same persons employed a long
 “ time the most noted Divines in *Europe*, and oc-
 “ casioned a schism which lasted above thirty years.
 “ It ought not to seem strange that it should be
 “ so difficult a matter to decide which of the Popes
 “ was the Head of the Church. It would have
 “ been much easier to alledge good reasons to re-
 “ ject them both. However, this Schism divided
 “ all Christendom, each state declaring for one
 “ or other of the two Popes, not so much from
 “ the consideration of the right of the parties, as
 “ for reasons of state. *France*, whose interest it
 “ was that the Pope should reside at *Avignon*,
 “ sided with *Clement*; and, for a contrary reason,
 “ *England* thought it more advantageous to ad-
 “ here to the Pope of *Rome*.” *Tindal’s Translation*,
 8vo, 1727, vol. IV. p. 377.

“ *France*,”

“*France*,” says Dr. Geddes, “declared itself
 “presently for *Clement*, and so did *Scotland*, *Ca-*
 “*stile*, *Arragon*, and *Sicily*. *England*, which in
 “those days understood its own interest so well
 “as not to do a thing that would visibly advance
 “the power of *France*, declared presently for
 “*Urban*; and, besides *Rome* and a part of *Italy*,
 “it was the only country I can find that declared
 “for him at first.” *Tracts*, 1730, vol. III. p. 293.
 And as, according to the same learned writer,
 [*ibid.* p. 304.] “*Urban* and his successors, and
 “not *Clement* and his, are, by all the *Roman*
 “writers since the end of that Schism, reckoned
 “to have been the true Bishops of *Rome*,” the
 Roman Catholics are not a little obliged to the
English Parliament for legitimating the succession
 of the Popes by so early and so essential a sanction.
 We may hope, at least, that after this discovery
 the Papists, out of mere prudence, will cease to
 upbraid us with a *Parliamentary* religion.

If the *Scottish* records so far back were in be-
 ing, it is not impossible that an Act of their Par-
 liament in favour of *Clement* VII might be found
 among them. Mr. *Bower's* History of this Schism
 is excellent, and makes one regret that he did not
 or could not take more time in the History of
 some of those Popes who lived nearer the present
 times. The literary world are not at all obliged
 to those who diverted him so long from this use-
 ful and edifying employment.

It was usual with an eminent Protestant Divine [Dr. Holland], when he took leave of his friends, to say, *Commendo vos amoris Dei, et odio Papismi*; I commend you to the love of God, and the hatred of Popery^a. I have no scruple in bidding adieu to my Protestant readers in the same terms. It is a just and a pious recommendation. The love of God and the love of Popery are irreconcilable. Whoever gives up his judgement and conscience to the spiritual dominion of mortal man, does it out of a sort of *fear which casteth out love*.

^a See The Life of Bishop Kennett, Appendix, p. 270.

F I N I S.





F•B







Blackburne, Francis

Considerations on the present state of the controversy between the
Protestants and Papists of Great Britain

London 1768

H.eccl. 132

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10023521-6